

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN UNITY

UNDER the heading of "Towards Christian Unity" the *Times* for April 4th publishes the substance of the "second interim report of the Sub-committee appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York's Committee and by representatives of the English Free Churches' Commissions" in connection with the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order that it is intended to convoke as soon as a suitable opportunity offers. This carries us back to the World Missionary Conference, as it was called at the time, which was held in Edinburgh in June, 1910. That Conference, it will be remembered, caused a great stir at the time among those interested in the furtherance and development of Protestant missionary enterprise, and was attended by a large number of clergy and laity belonging to the different Protestant communions of Great Britain and America and their dependencies, including several of the Anglican prelates, notably Archbishop Davidson, Bishops Gore and Talbot; but not, of course, any representatives of the Catholic Church, though the somewhat eccentric then Bishop of Cremona, Mgr. Bonomelli, sent them a letter of general but guarded sympathy which was much applauded. The meetings held extended over ten days and, besides the full reports of the proceedings which were given by some of the religious papers, as the *Guardian* and the *Christian World*, no less than nine volumes were published containing its *Acta*. How vivid was the impression made at the time on those who took part in the Edinburgh Conference is witnessed by the expressions of jubilation it evoked from the religious papers, Anglican and Nonconformist, in lieu of which, however, we must be content to cite the words of Sir Andrew Fraser in his address as chairman at the final meeting, when weighing the gigantic task which the Christian forces engaged in the conversion of the heathen were undertaking "without concerted policy, without adequate combination, and without sufficient generalship," he felt himself cheered by the Conference and encouraged by a vision of the future in which unity had become "natural and not forced," a vision which,

though the Conference itself which had disclosed it to them was about to end, "they would never more get out of their minds"; a feeling which Dr. Mott, who by his secretarial work had had most to do in bringing the Conference together, re-echoed by saying that "the end of the Conference was the beginning of the conquest . . . their best days were ahead, they would go out from that hall to revise their plans not in the light of their own reasons but of His reasons and wishes."

There was, as might have been expected, much in the proceedings to inspire an enthusiasm of this kind, for there were present men who could speak out of a most varied experience of missionary work, whose hearts were attuned to the vision of a world converted from heathenism to Christianity, for the realization of which they had been drawn to the missionary life and had made sacrifices at no small cost to themselves. But, as the words cited show, the vital thing about the meetings was the desire that animated its members to work for the attainment of an organized and living unity, corresponding to the ideal which Holy Scripture, indeed the very words of the Redeemer, had set before them, and which the widening experience of their missionary life was ever more and more impressing upon them as essential if their evangelical work was to be fruitful under the blessing of the Spirit. They felt in fact, all these good men gathered together in conference from divers parts of the earth, that like the Prophet Ezekiel they were standing in vision before a field of dry bones, and hearing the voice of God putting to them the same question as of old, Can these dry bones live? O they were so fair and shapely in themselves, these evangelists of the world in the destination they had sought to recognize as their vocation, and yet they lay there so dead and helpless in their isolations and divisions. If only they could be brought together, and organized into the one whole for which their several articulations designed them, "bone" being joined "to his bone," and sinew and flesh being laid upon the bones, and skin upon these as the final and goodly covering; and if only the breath of life at the word of prophecy would enter into the fair structure, so that "they might all live and stand up upon their feet, an exceeding great army," to go forth and gather the nations into the unity of the kingdom of Christ! Such was the vision and one cannot wonder that the bare thought of such a prospect

should have kindled in them an enthusiasm, to the fervour of which words such as those we have cited bear witness.

They recognized, too, that if this blessed vision were to be realized, though it was the Spirit of God that must primarily create it, there was a work of preparation and co-operation which they themselves must undertake. The only thing was that, when they turned to look at the difficulties that lay in their path, they felt keenly how the cold grasp of individualism, though tempered by their longing for unity, still clung tightly to the dry bones of their divisions, and they could see nothing effectual that could be accomplished then and there. All therefore that could be effected for the moment was to establish a Continuation Commission which should be international and intersectional in its *personnel*, and confide to that the task of keeping alight the flame that had been kindled and working steadily in the different countries to prepare the way for a second World Missionary Conference, this time to be called simply the World Conference, and when the difficulties had been sufficiently thought out and modes of solution likely to be satisfactory digested, take measures to convoke it.

It was not a bad idea, and since the dissolution of the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 these Continuation Committees, which though primarily one, have had necessarily to be organized separately for the different countries, have been at work. Readers may turn for instance to the *Constructive Review* for last December to an article by Dr. Newman Smyth on "Preparation for the World Conference," which is in fact the text of a paper read at the meeting of the North American Preparatory Conference on January 23rd of last year. The Report recently issued by the Sub-Committee for England, which has occasioned this article, is another instance of a similar kind, but one which as directly coming from the relevant organization in our own country is specially worthy of our attention. We may therefore venture to make a few comments upon its contents. If in these we shall be obliged to insist on the hopelessness of a good deal which this report proposes, we trust that, after what we have so far said, it will not be set down to any want of sympathy for the new movement itself, which on the contrary seems to us to be a sign of the times well worthy of our sympathy. All that we would aim at by the suggestions we offer is to point out to

those concerned a direction which their labours may take without calling upon them to sacrifice any of their present convictions, yet leading them towards the only true goal.

Let us begin by transcribing a paragraph from their report which declares the goal they set before themselves in terms with which we can sympathise without the slightest reservation.

In all our discussions we were guided by two convictions from which we could not escape and would not even if we could. It is the purpose of our Lord that believers in Him should be one visible society, and this unity is essential to the purpose of Christ for His Church and for its effective witness and work in the world. The conflict among Christian nations has brought home to us with a greater poignancy the disastrous results of the divisions which prevail among Christians, inasmuch as they have hindered that growth of mutual understanding which it should be the function of the Church to foster, and because a Church which is itself divided cannot speak effectively to a divided world.

The visible unity of believers which answers to our Lord's purpose must have its source and sanction, not in any human arrangements, but in the will of the One Father, manifested in the Son, and effected through the operation of the Spirit; and it must express and maintain the fellowship of His people with one another in Him. Thus the visible unity of the Body of Christ is not adequately expressed in the co-operation of the Christian Churches for moral influence and social service, though such co-operation might with great advantage be carried much further than it is at present; it could only be fully realized through community of worship, faith, and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper. This would be quite compatible with a rich diversity in life and worship.

In approaching their immediate task they remind themselves and their readers that in presenting their report they are not formulating any basis for reunion of Christendom, but are preparing for the consideration of such a basis at the projected Conference on Faith and Order. This may seem a timid way of affirming their objects, but it was a point to be borne in mind. As has been said the present report is their second, and is on Order. A previous report on Faith had been issued by them, that is, on the basis of beliefs to which the coming world Conference will have to get its adherents to commit themselves. In this previous report "they were not attempting to draw up a creed for subscription, but desired to affirm their agreement upon certain foundation truths as the

basis of a spiritual and rational creed and life for all mankind in Christ Jesus our Lord, and it was a matter of profound gratitude to God that they found themselves so far in agreement."

We should like to have given our readers the substance of this previous report, the subject being so essential as a condition of reunion, but we do not happen to have observed it when it was published, and the papers, in publishing this second interim report, are so casual as to omit giving the date of the first, and in the time at our disposal we have accordingly not been able to find it. Still it is not indispensable for an estimate of the kind of preparation for the coming Conference which the standing committees are making. The words just cited from the introductory paragraph to the present report indicate that in the previous one they had not been able to recommend any far-reaching plan of agreement as feasible. This too is what is to be inferred from the dealing with the subject of creed which characterized the Edinburgh Meeting—as to which the leading article in the *Christian World* for June 23, 1910, commented not without pleasure.

The Council of Edinburgh [says this critic] would not attempt anything so futile as the definition of faith that should be believed at all times and in all places under pain of denunciation as heretics and schismatics. . . . The question of creeds cropped up many times, but with results that few except missionaries could have anticipated. The logic of missionary work, the exigencies of evangelism face to face with non-Christian religions, the insight which long contact with other peoples gives of the varying psychology of the nations and races of the world living under other skies with specialised civilisations and with centuries or milleniums of social, philosophical and religious traditions, have forced missionaries to reconsider the whole question of creeds and confessions under which they themselves were brought up, and to feel that they are not at all suitable media for the communication of Christian truth to native minds. The verdict has gone forth decisively and unanimously against creeds. Creeds do not help, they hinder missionary evangelism. . . . If the Council of Edinburgh were to crystallise its faith into a symbol, it would probably run something like this. Only Christ is Catholic. Every creed and confession, every theology and Church polity is only local, temporal, and sectional.

This, it may be said, is only the opinion of the writer of the article, and at best reflects the extent to which the periodical

admitting it has fallen away from the beliefs which the founders of English Puritanism clung to so tenaciously in their day. It is, however, the testimony of a reporter who was present at the Conference and wished to report accurately what he had heard there, and who illustrates what he refers to by the words of representative speakers who took part in it. Thus a "Japanese missionary" said, "We must get out of the way with our dogmatisms and let Christ make His personal, direct, magnetic appeal to the Japanese nation," whilst others said that "Chinese and Africans would take matters into their own hands, and settle what should be the one Church for their own lands" if we do not settle it for them. And Principal Harada, "the distinguished head of the Doshisha," a Congregationalist of whom, in the opinion of this *Christian World* critic, "world Congregationalism may be proud" could say that "Christianity was a life, and the faith should be the natural and native expression of the experience of that life," a dictum which reads sufficiently well to take in many of our modern sciolists, but suggests wonderful things to any one who will be at the pains to think out the form it is likely to take in the concrete when applied to native life in the missionary countries. Indeed one cannot but ask oneself what use there can be in a scheme for reunion which can contemplate such varieties of belief within its circumscription. And yet when the Conference at its final meeting heard Bishop Talbot, then of Southwark but now of Winchester, warning the audience that "it would not do to plant one Christian Church in China and leave out of it altogether the great Roman communion, a section of Christendom which at this moment, he was told by high authority, had considerably more members in the non-Christian world than all of them put together," it seemed manifest that all this toleration of divers beliefs by which different races are allowed to express their conceptions of the personality and teaching of Christ cannot be unavoidable. Certainly its necessity is not felt by the native converts of that one vast communion to which Bishop Talbot referred.

But let us come to the outlines of the scheme now suggested for the basis of Order in the united Church which these well-meaning enthusiasts hope to see established as the result of their endeavours. They tell us they find themselves faced by two facts seemingly opposite which if unity is to result must

be brought into accord. One fact is that "in the greater part of Christendom episcopacy is the recognized organ of the unity and continuity of the Church," and accordingly that the members of the Episcopal Churches ought not to be required to abandon it as a condition of entering into communion with other communities. The other fact is that there are a number of Christian Churches not accepting the episcopal order which have been used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints; and that these have further acquired for themselves a recognizable position by the included fact that they were "led in response to fresh apprehensions of divine Truth to give expression to certain types of Christian experience, aspiration, and fellowship, and to secure rights of the Christian people which had been neglected or denied." We do not find the real opposition between these two modes of Church government very clearly indicated in these phrases. Surely it lies in this that one side regards episcopal government as essential because imposed by the divine will of the Founder of the Church, whilst the other regards it as neither essential nor desirable. But let us hear how these opposites are to be made to co-exist, for co-exist they must if neither side is to disown its part as the report stipulates, but on the contrary, all the coalescing communities are to "maintain the continuity of their witness and influence, as heirs and trustees of types of Christian thought, life, and order." The following paragraphs explain to us the method by which in the estimation of the Sub-Committee this particular mode of circle can be squared.

1. That continuity with the historic Episcopate should be effectively preserved.

2. That in order that the rights and responsibilities of the whole Christian community in the government of the Church may be adequately recognized, the Episcopate should resume a constitutional form, both as regards the method of the election of the Bishop as by clergy and people, and the method of government after election. It is perhaps necessary that we should call to mind that such was the primitive ideal and practice of Episcopacy and it so remains in many Episcopal communions to-day.

3. That acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy and not any theory as to its character should be all that is asked for. We think that this may be the more easily taken for granted as the acceptance of any such theory is not now required of ministers of the Church of

England. It would, no doubt, be necessary before any arrangement for corporate reunion could be made to discuss the exact functions which it may be agreed to recognize as belonging to the Episcopate, but we think this can be left to the future.

. . . Within such a recovered unity we should agree in claiming that the legitimate freedom of prophetic ministry should be carefully preserved and in anticipating that many customs and institutions which have been developed in separate communities may be preserved within the larger unity of which they have come to form a part.

As outside critics reading these suggestions we cannot think they are likely to be of much assistance to the Conference when it meets and begins its deliberations. Certainly the non-episcopal communities, unless they materially change their present views, are not likely to accept an episcopal organization that is not watered down to the degree indicated, but on the other hand is it likely that more than a small section of the Anglican community will consent to retain so little of what they have hitherto understood to be included in the episcopal character? It is true, as the recent appointment of Bishop Henson has made painfully clear, that the acceptance of no theory of the episcopate is now required of ministers of the Church of England, but, as long as this is the case, in what sense can the retention of episcopal government be regarded as the organ of unity and continuity in the Church, at all events as regards faith, apart from the preservation of which the preservation of nothing else is of much value for unity?

And then again, what security do these provisions offer for the lasting endurance of the unity thus cemented? They are at best founded on the chance statistics of the individualism of the moment. There is no formal principle generally recognized and agreed upon which shall control the changes and vagaries through which these statistics are likely to pass as time runs on, for it is a patent fact to any student of history, indeed to the older members of the present generation, that there was much more agreement among these bodies fifty years ago than there is at present, the dominant characteristic of the last half-century in its religious aspect being that the movement called liberalism or rationalism has frittered away very considerably belief even in the most fundamental of what fifty years ago were almost universally considered the

essential doctrines and practices of Christian order and worship. What security, then, can these reunionists promise themselves that after another half-century or even much less, the reuniting bodies will continue to hold their present credal and governmental views, if no principle is to bind them together save the rope of sand of their innumerable private judgments?

For the reasons thus briefly stated in outline we cannot see any prospect of this World Conference if it meets resulting in any satisfactory scheme for reuniting the members of the scattered communities that look forward to it. Still, the idea of this World Conference is excellent in itself; excellent in the conviction that has inspired it, the conviction that "a Church which is divided cannot speak effectually to a divided world"; excellent in its determination to work for the removal of these disastrous divisions and to labour for the restoration of a religious unity which since it was the purpose of our Lord that it should exist in the form of one visible Church must be attainable to those who go the right way to work for it; excellent in its resolution to meet together again in a Conference as comprehensive as possible, and, in the endeavour to make that future Conference practicable, to entrust to the Continuation Committees the task of preparing the plans for deliberations that may be really profitable.

May we then venture, as we doubt if the scheme can hope to be profitable if conducted on the lines suggested by this sub-committee's report, to suggest to the latter another line of thought which might lead to better results. History both past and contemporary has set before them, and they recognize it, one venerable Church which at all events to an imposing extent has realized throughout the Christian period the idea of such a visible church as they are seeking for. Of course they do not admit its claims but at least they are impressed by the extent and character of its influence, and would be delighted if they could induce its rulers to let their people take part in the coming World Conference. The cordiality with which they received the Bishop of Cremona's letter witnesses to this. There was a time when their religious forefathers entertained the most hostile ideas in regard to that ancient and widespread Church, its doctrines, its spirit, its aims, and the beliefs and sentiments of its members. But things have altered very much during the last generation or

two. The Catholics (or let us, to avoid any friction over names, call them here the Roman Catholics) clergy and laity alike, now-a-days are better known and may we not say better appreciated, than in the past. They meet with philanthropic and religious-minded men of other creeds, on the platform and in committee-rooms, and work together over schemes of social and other improvement; have come to understand one another, and have learnt how many points and aims they have in common—does not this suggest that the coming Conference might be well-advised if in its search for a method of unity it made a study of that world-wide unity commonly called the Catholic Church, of the principles on which it is based and the secret of its success? Might it not be well then if the Continuation Committees which are preparing for it were to recommend for its consideration such questions as the following: Can you have governmental unity except on the basis of submission to a presiding authority, and can you have doctrinal unity without submission to a doctrinal authority? Can the members of a Church submit to such an authority whether governmental and doctrinal, unless it can offer them a guarantee that by submitting to it they will not be jeopardising but guarding the allegiance of the human mind to religious truth? And can such a guarantee be had except in the form of a divine promise to protect and guide this authority through the ages?

The consideration of these three questions is obviously an indispensable preliminary to the study of the structure and of the history, past and present, of the great Church whose unity and tenacity of life is felt to be so impressive, since to study it without this equipment would be to study it without eyes to see into the principles of its cohesion. But this point once grasped other questions at once arise, which the Conference will need to put before it. Has belief in an authority thus endowed with the promise of divine guidance a sufficient ground of support in positive history, that is to say, in the positive history of the records of the New Testament and of early Christian history, indeed of the entire history of the Church itself from its beginnings onwards? A question like this doubtless opens out an enormous field for investigation, but it is one every inch of which has been examined over and over again by ecclesiastical scholars whose treatises are available for students; so that the task of the Continuation

Committees could be facilitated by classifying their writings and calling the attention of the Conference to the vital points in their argumentation. It is a frequent charge made by Catholic scholars against their non-Catholic critics that the latter can never be got to study their treatises with sufficient diligence to grasp their thoughts and contentions with precision, and so are never able seriously to weigh the force of their arguments. This surely should not be, and when such a question as the healing of the world's divisions is being considered by a World Conference of the kind anticipated, is it not an occasion when this charge made as it is in a not unfriendly spirit should be seriously taken in hand and examined in the spirit of impartiality and prayerfulness, which the Edinburgh Conference recognized as that needful and wished to embrace?

And one more point would need to be considered if this suggestion were carried out. Not the credentials only of the authority which the Catholic Church believes to have been set over her by her divine Founder, but the particular doctrines also which form her creed and explain and control her spiritual life are wont to be sorely misunderstood and hence misrepresented by her critics. Here again is a field of study which the Conference should be invited by the preparatory committees to examine in all seriousness, availing themselves for this purpose of the many treatises of exposition which Catholic scholarship has provided. Dr. Newman Smyth, in the lecture already cited as published by the *Constructive Review* (a review by-the-by which originated in the proceedings of the Edinburgh Conference and has all along sought to be an organ of its movement for reunion) notes that the Reunion Conference of Polish Protestants at Thorn in 1645 and the decrees of the Council of Trent held about a hundred years earlier, are seen, if compared, to be fairly at one in their affirmations but strongly opposed in their negations; and he takes this to be a general characteristic of such Councils and Conferences. We do not think this criticism is accurate; the difference between affirmations and negations is rather in the form of expression employed, it being usually possible though more cumbrous to express the negations in positive language and the affirmations in negative language. Still there is an element of truth in what Dr. Smyth says. Very often indeed there is an underlying agreement between Christian disputants.

as to fundamental points but buried beneath a superincumbent mass of misunderstanding. This is the case for instance between those who affirm or deny the Catholic doctrine of justification by faith with works or without them; or again between those who regard sacramental efficacy as truly spiritual and those who regard it as magic and superstitious; or again between those who regard prayers to the saints as dishonouring to God, and those who regard them as valuable and natural. In these and many similar cases of doctrine such a study of Catholic theology as we are asking for might if recommended by the Continuation Committees and accepted by the coming Conference be of the greatest value in the interest of reunion.

It is likely enough that many will regard this suggestion on our part as preposterous, yet if they will only think it over carefully, bearing in mind that at all events it comes from those who recommend a visible Church that has retained its unity and embraced many millions of men in its fold not for a short time only but throughout the Christian centuries, they may come to think that it is a suggestion worth their serious consideration. Nor is it necessary that to give it a place in the proceedings they should set aside their own as exhibited in the report on which this article is a comment. Let the two stand together and be considered together comparatively. In this way those who are promoters of the idea of a new World Conference will at least attain this that they will draw the great Catholic party to take a deeper interest in its proceedings. They can never be brought to take part in it if the stipulation is to be that the reunion sought is to be on a basis of compromise, but they would gladly co-operate if it were to include the study of the principles and facts on which their own world-wide unity rests.

S. F. S.

A SUMMER TRIPTYCH

I.

THE bend of the road below Woodchester. The old churchyard, with its pitiful fragment of ruin, its lank grass and lichen-covered stones sinking at all angles into the soft, boggy earth, has been left behind, and gladly enough too, for its gloom and eeriness are such that no spectre need wait the fall of night to flit in transparent ghostly shape across its nameless tombs or through the black shadow of its mournful cedars; the steep little hill has been climbed, and the stile into the hilly field (where a brown mare and her beautiful timid foal stand sleepily in the sun), and the Wayfarer is down on the road again. It is an unknown road, with the deep shadow of pine trees on one hand and on the other a hedge, white and sweet with late hawthorne and just high enough to hide the water, whose bubbling progress is the only sound to be heard.

The road is deserted, at least as far as eye can see, for, of course, like all the twisted riband of Gloucestershire's roadways, it winds in and out so that one never knows its future for more than fifty yards at a time, nor what delight lies hid beyond its next alluring curve. A few paces further, however, and a fresh sound strikes the ear—the chink of a spade in newly-turned earth; and the road presently reveals a plot of land luxuriant with peas and young lettuces, with a tiny old grey cottage pushed into one corner and an ancient, weather-beaten man patiently delving a patch of ground beside it. The cottage is very, very old, for a gaping crack appears in the moss-grown wall which abuts on the road, and dandelions and grass grow in the fissures of its shelving roof; a climbing rose in full flower makes a vivid patch of colour against the grey wall, but even this, with its buds formed only yesterday, has a twisted and sturdy stem which tells the tale of its venerable years. Perhaps, indeed, in some bygone time, it was planted and trained by the strong brown hands which, knotted now and twisted as old ivy, still wield the spade in the fragrant earth near by; for, old as it is, it surely yields place to this ancient husbandman who might well have learnt his trade from his father Adam, so furrowed is his shaggy brow and so full of silent wisdom are the deep.

pools of his dark eyes. He turns slowly at the Wayfarer's greeting and straightens his tall figure to its full height; his clothes and his person are as brown and stained as any of the great trees standing sentinel over his ancient home.

"Beg pardon, ma'am," he says in a slow gruff voice to my question.

"Can you tell me where this road leads to?"

"Ay . . . Woodchester," he answers, "surely."

"I know, I've just come from Woodchester. I mean the other way."

Once again he turns slowly and, shielding his eyes with his earth-grimed hand, looks steadily down the white road as though he would fain pierce its secret; then his solemn gaze travels back and his grey head shakes doubtfully as he stares at the Wayfarer.

"Ah dunno, . . ." he says thoughtfully, "Ah ain't never bin daon that way. . . ."

And so, as if it were all a Parable of Youth and Age, the Ancient returns again to dig and delve the land whereon he was born, and the Wayfarer, being young, sets out undaunted along the unknown road. . . .

II.

The way to Avening, with the four-mile signpost from Nailsworth nearly a mile and a half behind. The open length of road (where the sun beat down so hotly on the white, dusty path, and the ridge of the steeply-rising fields on the right was seen in a haze of shimmering heat) has failed in its lurid temptation to despair, and the Wayfarer, warm but victorious, treads a path still cool with the dews of last night and springy with the leaves of last year. The trees meet in a mist of green high overhead . . . a leafy arcade, cool and quiet as any cloister, pierced every now and then, as from a tapering lancet window, by a sudden shaft of sunlight as the breeze stirs the leaves and the branches sway and part and meet again, with a soft sound like the fiful sighing of a summer sea. The way winds in and out seemingly along the side of a hill, for while on the right the ground rises until the trees which thickly clothe it tower mountain-high above, on the left of the narrow roadway it slopes steeply down for perhaps sixty or seventy feet, so that here and there, as just now, where a tall tree uprooted by some bygone storm has crashed down through its neighbour's branches, one looks through a

little clearing over the tops of the trees in the valley to the wooded and sunlit country beyond. Sometimes one catches too, a glimpse of water lying far below, still and green and cool and dappled with flat white lilies or fringed with spears of yellow Iris . . . in one place even, where the sun shines in from the open fields beyond, the clear pool mirrors the rainbow hues of a bank of gorgeously flowering rhododendrons. The quiet lane, too, has its mozaic of colour, from the bronze and emerald of ground ivy to the rose and blue of wild geranium and speedwell; for all the lower reaches of the wooded banks are carpeted with blossom, stellaria and bugle, silver-weed and Robin-run-the-hedge, while pale, wild Arum lilies stand straight and fragrant among their beautiful dark leaves.

Suddenly, arresting as a song, the sound of falling water strikes across the stillness, and from some hidden source a thin clear stream comes splashing and tumbling down, darting like a streak of quicksilver among the gnarled roots of trees, over soft mosses, under the broad leaves of dock and curled fronds of young bracken, only to disappear, as suddenly as a conjuror's trick, in some unsuspected cleft of rock. It is one of the thousand water-rills of Gloucestershire . . . those tiny cascades or swiftly moving streams which render the whole country-side musical with rippling sound, and whose clear waters make beautiful the very pebbles over which they flow.

The Wayfarer stands to listen . . . to catch every note of the chorus of sound set in that cool, green stillness . . . the sighing rustle of un-numbered leaves, the liquid ripple of water, the soft low call of a wood-pigeon, the tap of a broken twig falling on the soft moss, the crackle of brushwood under the scurrying patter of a sleek, grey rat, or the furry thud of a hurriedly-hopping rabbit, the shrill clear chatter of a bird. . . .

"Hi, Miss! ye ain't seen a lill' black pig come this way, 'av ye?" (Oh, those wicked, winding roads that curve so sharply in and out! There's never any telling *what* may not be approaching round the next treacherous corner! Here now, for instance, has suddenly appeared a small boy, tousled-headed and bare-footed and ragged, with a baker's dozen of tiny grunting pigs, black and pink, tumbling their fat little bodies over one another in the roadway before him . . . a veritable Prodigal son among his swine! Unanswered, his

doleful voice goes on . . .) " Because I've lost 'un. I've cum with this littl' lot fra' Tetbury, an' I left un by the side o' the road while I went to look arter that lill' pink un there wot was squealin' somethin' awfu', an' when I cum back the blasted lill' black un were clean gone. . . . Whoop, there! " The Wayfarer condoled as sympathetically as the proximity of the snorting, unlovely herd would allow, but the Prodigal was uncomforted. He shook his head mournfully.

" An' to think, . . . " he said, " I brought un all the way fra' Tetbury . . . "

Presently, as with a sudden gleam of hope, he demanded.

" Miss, can ye whistle? "

". . . er, . . . yes, . . . sometimes."

" Wal, ef ye see that lill' black pig, ye might whistle an' I'll cum for un, . . . 'cause I brought un all the way fra' Tetbury. . . . " His voice trailed regretfully into reminiscent silence until it rose again in a sudden " Whoop, there! " addressed to the unlost and unruly pigs.

In a little while, then, the mournful Prodigal and his drove had disappeared round the bend in the road, and the Wayfarer was faring on her way, a trifle less care-free than of yore, maybe, for if the little black pig should be found, it would have to be carried the remainder of its eleven-mile journey to market, for, alas! . . . it was a hot day, and whistle . . . the Wayfarer could not! . . .

III.

There is a little corner of Waterlow Park which, especially in early summer, is worth a pilgrimage; but not at all simply because of the notice-board at the entrance informing all comers that within this enclosure are to be found all the plants and herbs mentioned in the works of one William Shakespeare; although, perhaps, the garden does owe more than a little of its quiet charm to the immortal Bard, for under his influence, it is fashioned as were the pleasaunces of his day, and its flowers are such as made gay the parterres where our great-great-grandmothers played as little children.

There is a tiny fountain playing at the meeting-place of the trim paths which bisect the garden, and to north, south, east and west the generous beds are a riot of colour, of rose and honeysuckle, hollyhock, foxglove and larkspur, peony and evening-primrose; while away to the west, at the foot

of the tall poplars, quivering and straight against the clear sky, a sheet of still water is spread, set deeply in the green grass and mirroring in its cool depths the orange, and mauve and scarlet of rhododendrons. Beyond the flower-beds a line of trees, beech and hawthorn, laburnum and Guelder-rose, shut out all sight and sound of the world, and guard inviolate the quiet garden's peaceful seclusion. . . .

And here, once upon a time, when the day was closing in and the misty blue of the larkspurs faded in the distance into the gathering shadow of twilight, there came two who knew but of one flower of which the wise Shakespeare also wrote; a flower which, unnoticed and unlabelled with learned Latin, needs no garden in which to grow, whose colour is the added brightness its presence gives to every hue and whose fragrance is that of all sweet, aromatic things. . . .

They walked, hand in hand, down the trim pathway; he with his "pearlies" and his blue tie and his broad-brimmed bowler a little bit over one eye; she with her feathers and her velvet and her high-heeled shoes, and together they stood by the fountain, while a single star shone suddenly diamond-bright in the pale, saffron sky.

The Wayfarer, eavesdropping, alas! heard their secret.

"Yus, I sez to 'er, you're balmy, I sez; balmy on the crumpet, that's wot you are, I sez. . . ."

"You never . . .!" he murmured admiringly.

"I did . . . every word of it. An' she sez to me . . ."

But the larkspur shivered in the evening breeze, and the hollyhock swayed . . . as though there passed a Shade . . . a Shade which murmured softly to the night:

"My love's
More richer than my tongue. . . ."

LUCY M. CURD, T.O.S.D.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

WHATEVER be the fate of other details in the two new Education Bills, proposed for England and Scotland respectively, it is practically certain that the school leaving-age will be raised. This addition of one or two years to the compulsory school period will be of great service to religion, for it will necessitate a revision and extension of the syllabus of religious instruction. The following remarks are penned in the hope that more than a revision of the syllabus will be attempted. It is widely felt that, in the interests of the Church herself, a change in method is also desirable, for what Bishop Bellord wrote about twenty years ago, "the chief cause of the 'leakage' is the imperfection of our system of religious instruction," is still unfortunately true.

Those lost to the Church in this country consist almost entirely of past pupils of the elementary schools, whose religious instruction depends in varying degrees on parent, priest, and teacher. As far as mere instruction goes, the last-named has greatest responsibility, for though in many working-class homes moral and spiritual training is excellently given, industrial conditions rarely allow leisure and opportunity for tuition in religious subjects. And although in many parishes the clergy preside over Sunday Schools, the numbers attending are generally too large for satisfactory teaching. It is on the lay teacher during the "religious" hour that the burden falls of working through the syllabus and, although it is to be hoped that the clergy will some day be less overworked and more able to take part in the instruction of the children, it will always be the Catholic teachers' most cherished privilege to convey to their charges the most valuable of all forms of knowledge, that of their Faith. With this feature of the present system they have no quarrel. Nor, of course, do they complain that the syllabus of work to be done should be set by the diocesan authorities. It is rather the form in which the matter of instruction is presented, and the methods by which it is tested that seem in the circumstances to call for reconsideration.

The matter to be taught is contained in the syllabus. When leaving school at the age of fourteen every child is supposed to have learned by heart and understood the whole of the Catechism, to have received instruction, properly so called, in the different doctrinal points it summarizes, and, in addition, to know certain prayers and the outlines of the Old and New Testaments. In practice the repetition of the Catechism takes most of the time—which comes to mean that most of the period set apart for “religious” is spent in strengthening the memory. Doubtless, the amount to be learnt in the time is not large; still, it is the quality, not the quantity, that hampers the teachers. It is not the length of answers but their difficulty that proves the stumbling-block and eats up the time. Two lines of simple words could be learnt in a couple of minutes. Two lines of long and unfamiliar words require many a weary repetition before they are firmly fixed in the memory. Most teachers can give examples of the queer answers and quaint phrases that they get from their pupils after a class has been constantly repeating some question. Our present Catechism, clear, orderly and logical though it seems to the adult mind, is not so suitable for the immature. To take but a few objections. There is the general complaint that so many of the questions, by suggesting the answers within themselves, are no real test of the child's knowledge. Moreover, there are many unnecessary questions and these, often enough, are precisely the ones most difficult accurately to memorize. The little child asked, “What is the second article of the Creed?” will, even if it knows at what point in the Creed to begin, not know where to stop unless by frequent repetition the limit is impressed on its mind. In any case it is of comparatively little importance to know the position of the dogma in the series, provided its meaning is understood. And the grasping of the meaning is sometimes made unnecessarily difficult, as when the child is asked first, “What do you mean by the Incarnation?” and then later “What does the Third Article mean?” two slightly different answers being provided for what is practically the same question. Furthermore, the fact that certain parts of the earlier chapters are left to a later stage shows that the plan is recognized as not wholly suited to the child's mind. It would be a relief to see the Catechism turned upside down and the two last chapters, those on the

"Christian Rule of Life," and "Daily Exercise" which are the most practical, placed in the beginning. They contain matter that the youngest child can understand and appreciate; as things are, only the children who reach the top classes ever learn them at all.

Of course this criticism raises the old controversy as to the desirability and value of the catechetical method. The children have to learn question and answer, and generally cannot recall the latter without the former. Would not better results be obtained from the learning of short statements? In the article on Christian Doctrine in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Archbishop Walsh suggests something of that nature. He recommends the introduction of short reading lessons, one to be appended to each chapter of the Catechism.

These should deal in somewhat fuller form with the matter dealt with in the questions and answers of the Catechism. The insertion of such lessons would make it possible to omit *without loss* [*italics mine*] many questions, the answers to which now impose a heavy burden on the memory of the children.

The Archbishop suggests that the frequent reading of these lessons would fix their matter in the children's minds. It would make the religious lessons far more living and interesting if the matter now contained in, say, one group of questions were treated widely, illustrated from Church history and Saints' lives, etc., and worked up into a fairly long and picturesque reading lesson, which, when read by the children, might be explained, amplified, and still further illustrated by the teacher. This could be followed by a short statement, to be learnt by heart, containing the essential matter. Thus would the instruction come first in time as it does in importance.

Some subjects would require many such lessons, others would be exhausted in one. Take as an example a lesson on "Indulgences." Let the reading lesson give an account of the conditions of the early Church as regards penitential practices, the rigorous canonical penance exacted, the different classes of penitents. Then describe the trial and sufferings of the martyrs in one of the persecutions, and show how very early the custom began of the penitents trying to obtain from the martyrs a "bill of peace" to be shown to the Bishop as a plea based on the martyr's sacrifice for the remission of part,

or the whole, of the canonical penance. Mention the abuses which the Church has to combat in regard to this practice, and her gradual restriction of the power of granting remissions to the ecclesiastical authorities. At this point the later abuses which gave Luther occasion for his revolt must be mentioned, and then the way is clear for the statement of the doctrine set free from misrepresentations. At the end there should be a short summary of all this, to be learnt by heart. And all the way through the question of language should be carefully attended to in view of the limited vocabulary and small reflective ability of the child.

This method clearly necessitates a knowledge of Church History, a fact which suggests another defect of our present system. It is not an exaggeration to say that many of our children, leaving school, have no adequate conception of the Church. It is the building they worship in that the term recalls, not the Mystical Body of Christ, of which they have the privilege of being members. At present they learn, in their New Testament, of the Founding of the Church; they learn, generally when they are too young to appreciate it, the ninth article of the creed which tells them of her marks and infallibility—but of the expansion of the Church, its missionary efforts, its continuity throughout the ages, its vicissitudes amongst the nations, and its position to-day they learn next to nothing. Now the child naturally loves history. The history of its native land, properly taught, can be made very fascinating, and is regarded as the best means of inculcating a spirit of patriotism. The same surely holds good for the Church. Give the child a real idea of the Church, the greatest and most wonderful institution on earth, divinely founded and guided and guarded, yet officered by fallible human beings. Take the child through her history, telling of the storms that have raged around her, of the enemies who have stood against her, of its pagan and heretic foes, and of the traitors within who have been her greatest enemies. Let the children see the Church standing safe, impregnable, immortal amidst all these storms, and a spirit of pride and devotion will arise in their breasts. On the other hand, if the child has no knowledge of the history of the Church, can we blame the man for being upset by the lying tales of the anti-Catholic press and the glib suggestions of the biassed history book? These are days of general reading, and the Catholic

man, or woman, is not thoroughly armed to meet the assaults of book and press unless he, or she, has a knowledge of the history of the Church. Let us hope that the day is coming, and coming soon, when Church history will be taught in all the junior and senior classes.

Let us hope, too, that they will learn, not only of the Church in the past but of the Church now, of its activities in every corner of the world. The Church's doings of to-day are recorded in the Catholic press. If we are going to have our children in school for several more years surely some time could be given to a weekly study of a good Catholic paper. If each child persuades its people to buy a copy and brings it to school, some most interesting and valuable lessons on contemporary Church History could be arranged. Add to this, the advantage to the general interests of the Faith in having a powerful and well-supported Catholic press, fighting for the victory of truth and the overthrow of vice and error—an ideal perfectly realizable if only Catholics were taught from childhood their duty in its regard.

The lengthening of school life and the lessening of useless memory-tasks will provide time to work through a wonderfully widened syllabus. Part of the time must surely be used in the top classes in giving elementary lessons on social principles and problems from the Catholic point of view? Political power is passing into the hands of the masses: how important then a sound education in citizenship! None of the Church's tenets is antagonistic to the rights of labour. The children will have learnt from their ecclesiastical history that the Church was the mother and the nurse of Christian civilization, which is based upon the surpassing worth of the human soul. The study of Catholic Social Reform in the light of Pope Leo XIII.'s teaching will show them that to-day she remains the true, perhaps the only efficient, protector of the working man. When our own children understand and become convinced of that fact they can go out and join the small band who are working as apostles in propagating it. Contrariwise, irreligion will have won one of its greatest victories when it has persuaded the workers that the Church is their natural foe. And the reconstruction of our civilization, which has fallen through oblivion of the Christian ideal, will henceforth be impossible, unless Labour finds leaders amidst its own ranks who are fundamentally and consistently Christian.

One other point I should like to see brought into the new syllabus. Mother A. T. Drane in her *Christian Schools and Scholars* proves, by quotations, that in the darkest part of the so-called "dark ages" the uneducated people of these islands could follow, in substance at any rate, the arguments and exhortations of a Latin sermon, because they were familiar with the liturgical language of the universal Church. Yet these people never entered a school! On the other hand, from their earliest days these children were taught their prayers not only in the vernacular but also in Latin. Thus they learned the more familiar prayers, the Mass prayers, the Vesper hymns and anthems, and so had a fairly wide vocabulary of Latin words and inflections.

Is it too much to hope that we in time may be able to train our children up to as high a standard? With enthusiasm it could be done, and then Vespers could once again be the ordinary evening service. A class of older children, fourteen and fifteen years old, will drink in eagerly "John Ayscough's" description of the "Dies Iræ" in *San Celestino*, especially if they have read or listened to the Holy Pope's story. In the same way, they will revel in the story of Jacopone da Soldi and the "Stabat Mater" of St. Thomas of Aquin, and his Corpus Christi hymn, the "Lauda Sion." Why should so many of the Church's children grow up in entire ignorance of her glorious liturgy?

These additions to our programme necessarily mean an extension of the range of the teacher's studies, and the training-College syllabus must also be expanded. It is to be regretted that so little has been done to make Church History in its widest sense readily accessible. The average teacher, as things are, has not the time to read the longer works of Pastor, Gasquet, and other pioneers. Lord Acton, in one of his letters, speaking of history, said that the great necessity of the day was for middlemen who would delve into the deep, lengthy volumes of the master minds and produce from these sources well-written books to suit the popular taste and purse. We are glad to say that several works have lately appeared—the Church Histories of Fathers Stebbing and MacCaffrey, for instance—to remedy this need. But we want such books on every branch of Church knowledge, not merely for children who are already, to some extent, catered for, but mainly for the average grown-up reader.

One last word on the present system which I am persuaded

will be endorsed by most teachers. The work done is tested by an annual examination held by the diocesan authorities. I submit that this is not only very ineffectual as a test, but has other accidental results which are very harmful to the child's religious education. I do not think that religious instruction should ever be a mere subject of examination, or even be liable to be so treated, for the practically inevitable consequence is that the teacher is more concerned with what the children can be taught to say on examination-day than with what they learn during the term. The teacher knows that her work is judged by head teacher and managers on the strength of the report obtained at the examination, and, naturally enough, works to get her class letter-perfect and secure an "Excellent." Most examiners (how quickly one learns it) have pet subjects and pet methods. These are studied and have to be, if the examiner is to be pleased. A really good oral examiner is rarely met, for the task requires an unusual combination of qualities. And so the means is apt to be made the end, in the most important of all subjects. As long as the examination looms at the end of the year's work the teacher will have to consider that, and work for that, rather than the real interests of the children. It is quite possible for the two to clash. As the time for the examination approaches there is a speeding up, a constant cramming; when it has passed there is a reaction, less interest, and even less time, is given to the subject. It is essential, of course, absolutely essential, that the work done should be tested. But a far and away better test than examination would be inspection. The diocesan inspector would spend his time, as the secular ones do, visiting the schools in the district, listening to the daily lessons and helping the teacher in her daily work, supervising all. Were this system of inspection introduced now the inspectors would see the crippling effect of the present syllabus and be, I am sure, as anxious as the teachers are to see the whole system changed.

In all this much has been said of religious instruction but very little of religious training. Is it not probable that the boy who can follow his Mass in the Missal, who knows the history and meaning of its prayers and ceremonies, will pray better at Mass and miss it less often than his ignorant brother who knows none of these things and has only a superficial interest in the liturgy? Side by side with interesting instruction will go appeal to the heart and will. At the

end of the lesson when the interest has been held will come an appeal to the heart, and the whole will be clinched by a practical particular resolution of the will. Such lessons will be the dynamic force charging a well-spent character-forming day and linked together will form men and women who will be a credit to the Church and the school that trained them.

MARY CAHILL.

THE CLOISTER OF PAIN

WITHIN this Cloister dim,
No incense and no hymn,
But a Vision of woes that brood
O'er the burthened Rood.

The keen red-handed Pain
Tears at my flesh again,
And I shrink aghast, afraid,
With none to aid.

If deep in the night austere,
Some lonely star appear—
I cannot lift my eyes
To the scroll of the skies!

Lo—purple shadows pass,
'Tis the hour of the blessèd Mass.
Does the sun come now in the East?
It is day, at least.

And the Lord is lifted up,
In the Bread and the mystic Cup,
For me—no sound of the Mass,
No joy—alas!

In the Cloister of Pain I lie,
Roofed in with the bitter sky,
Ringed round by the walls of woe,
As the sad hours go.

Is it sad? 'Mid these shadows dim
Rise never Matins and hymn,
But—drippeth the Saving Blood
From the burthened Rood.

Day here is as drear as night,
But—the strange unfaltering Light
In the Face of the Only Son,
And Our pain is One!

M. G. CHADWICK.

NOTES ON FAMILIAR PRAYERS

IX. THE "GLORIA PATRI."

AFTER the Our Father, it may fairly be held that the *Gloria Patri* affords the earliest example of an ancient Christian prayer which is still in every day use. No doubt the Apostles' Creed is in some sense also a monument of quite primitive times, but on the one hand it can hardly in strictness be called a prayer, and on the other, in the exact form in which it is now familiar to us, it cannot be traced back further than the end of the seventh century.¹ The *Gloria Patri* or "little doxology"—a name by which it is distinguished from the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, or "great doxology"—represents a tradition which even more certainly takes us back to Apostolic times, and which also, after sundry modifications, must have assumed its present and final shape long before the year 529, for at that date, as we shall see, its use was already widespread throughout the greater part of western Christendom.

Considering the word doxology in its broader sense, which is simply "ascription of glory" (from *δόξα*, glory), it must be said that the custom of terminating a prayer by some sort of doxology was of older date than the coming of our Lord. Each of the first four books of the Psalms, according to what was probably the primitive division, concludes with an outburst of praise.² For example, to take the first book, which ends with Ps. xl. 14, we have "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting and to everlasting. Amen and amen." And similarly the fourth book terminates with the last verse of Ps. cv. "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting even to everlasting; and let all the people say, Amen. Praise ye the Lord." So again the apocryphal, but undoubtedly Jewish and pre-Christian, "Prayer of Manasses" ends with the words "to Thee is glory for ever and ever. Amen." In the New Testament the use of doxologies is of even more frequent occurrence. They are met with constantly in the epistles of St. Paul (*e.g.*, Ephes. iii. 21, etc.) and in the

¹ Of course there was an older Creed, the "old Roman," familiar to St. Irenæus and Tertullian, and probably Apostolic in its origin, which hardly differs from that now in use save by the absence of certain clauses which were added at a later date.

² In the Revised Version these divisions are headed Book I., Book II., etc.

Apocalypse (vii. 12, etc.), but we may especially note the conclusion of the Epistle of St. Jude: "To the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion and power, before all time, and now and for evermore. Amen." It will be noticed, however, that all these formularies of praise in the New Testament are addressed to one, or at most two, Persons only of the Blessed Trinity; and this in fact seems characteristic of the infancy of the Church, which at first probably was inclined in devotional matters to follow Jewish models. We may take as an illustration the conclusion of the so-called "Second Epistle of St. Clement," which Lightfoot describes as the earliest Christian homily extant, and which he assigns to about the date 120—140 A.D. The homily terminates thus:

To the only God invisible, the Father of truth, who sent forth unto us the Saviour and Prince of immortality, through whom also He made manifest to us the truth and the heavenly life, to Him be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

Another example of a doxology occurs in an ancient Christian prayer which is preserved for us among the papyri found at Oxyrhynchus. This copy was probably written at the end of the third century, but the prayer itself may be much older. It runs as follows:

O Almighty God who hast created the sky and the earth and the sea and all that they contain, help me, have mercy upon me, forgive me my sins, save me now and in the ages to come, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, through whom is glory and power for all ages of ages. Amen.¹

But nothing probably illustrates better the devotional spirit of the early centuries and the tendency to use some form of doxology as an independent acclamation, than the passage in the *Didache* which apparently describes some sort of primitive liturgy. I borrow the arrangement of Achelis.

But as touching the eucharistic thanksgiving give ye thanks thus. First as regards the cup:

We give thee thanks, O our Father, for the holy wine of Thy son David, which Thou madest known to us through Thy Son Jesus.

¹ The text has been edited again by C. Wessely, "Christian Papyri" in Nau's *Patrologia Orientalis*, IV. p. 195, and by Dom Leclercq in *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica* (1913), II. ii. p. clxxi. On p. clxxxix. may be found two other interesting doxologies taken from Schmidt and Schubert, *Altchristliche Texte*, pp. 112, 113. Both these are of the third century.

[*The Congregation.*] Thine is the glory for ever and ever.
Then as regards the broken bread.

We give Thee thanks, O our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known unto us through Thy Son Jesus.

[*The Congregation.*] Thine is the glory for ever and ever.

As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may Thy Church be gathered together from the end of the earth into Thy Kingdom.

[*The Congregation.*] For Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever and ever.¹

There is more to the same effect, but for our present purpose this illustration will suffice. It is highly probable that in the *Didache* we have to do with a document which belongs to either the close of the first or the beginning of the second century.

So far none of the doxological formulæ which we have been considering, following in this the example of the New Testament, contain any reference to the Blessed Trinity. "Glory be to God" is the theme, to which the more comprehensive add "through the Son" as a sort of Christian differentiation, to remind us that we are not now dealing merely with a survival of Judaism. The earliest certain example of a Trinitarian formulary of this kind is commonly supposed to be that preserved to us in the prayer of St. Polycarp² before his martyrdom (A.D. 155), which concludes as follows:

For this cause, yea and for all things, I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee through the eternal and heavenly High-priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, through whom with Him and the Holy Spirit be glory both now [and ever] and for the ages to come. Amen.³

The occurrence of the three words, "praise, bless and glorify" which are borrowed from, or at any rate are now found in, the greater doxology or *Gloria in excelsis* (laudamus Te, benedicimus Te, glorificamus Te) is an interesting testimony to the antiquity, often unsuspected, of many of the consecrated phrases employed in the liturgy. This reflection is perhaps the more in place on account of the recent and very remarkable trend of opinion in virtue of which

¹ See H. Achelis, *Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig, 1912, Vol. I. p. 179.

² See E. von der Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit*, Leipzig, 1901, p. 159; and cf. Chase, *The Lord's Prayer*, pp. 168—176.

³ Letter of the Smyrneans, ch. xiv. Lightfoot adds "and ever" on the authority of an early Latin version.

the ancient document, commonly known hitherto as the "Egyptian Church Order," is now looked upon as the embodiment of ecclesiastical constitutions which reach back to the early part of the third or even to the closing years of the first century after Christ. I do not propose to enter here upon a discussion which would divert our investigation from its immediate purpose, but I may note that the attempt of Theodor Schermann to connect his "General Church Order" with the name of Pope St. Clement has been favourably received by many scholars. Also it must be held to derive no little indirect support from the fact that both Dom Hugh Connolly² and Professor E. Schwartz³ have independently reached the conclusion that this so-called "Egyptian Church Order" is of Roman origin and of notably earlier date than any of the series of kindred documents.

If, therefore, we may regard Schermann's conclusions as invested with a certain degree of probability, we are led to the conclusion that already in the early part of the second century a Trinitarian doxology had come into use and had established itself in some cases as an independent formula of blessing or prayer. Even if, with Dom Connolly and Schwartz, we regard St. Hippolytus († 235) as the compiler of the Roman Church Order, we are probably justified in asserting that the earliest known analogue of our present *Gloria Patri* is to be found in the following brief direction:

But in every blessing let the words be used: "To Thee be glory, Father and Son with the Holy Ghost, in holy Church, both now and always and world without end. Amen."⁴

Origen tells us in his *Treatise Concerning Prayer*, probably written before A.D. 231, that "we ought to end every prayer with a doxology of God through Christ in the Holy Spirit."⁵ To this canon the prayers of the Roman Church Order for the most part conform. For the sake of its intrinsic interest we

¹ T. Schermann, *Die allgemeine Kirchenordnung, frühchristliche Liturgien und kirchliche Überlieferung*, Paderborn, 1914—1916.

² R. H. Connolly, *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and derived Documents*, Cambridge, 1916. See also the discussion by Dom H. Leclercq in *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica*, I. ii. lxvii.—lxxiv.

³ E. Schwartz, *Pseudopostolischen Kirchenordnungen*, Strassburg, 1910.

⁴ Schermann, *Allgemeine Kirchenordnung*, p. 46. The Latin, first edited by Hauler from the Verona MS. runs: "In omni vero benedictione dicatur 'Tibi gloria, patri et filio cum sancto spiritu in sancta ecclesia et nunc et semper et in omnia sæcula sæculorum (Amen).'"

⁵ Ἐπὶ πάντων τὴν εὐχὴν εἰς δοξολογίαν θεοῦ διὰ χριστοῦ ἐν ἁγίᾳ πνεύματι καταπνεύσας.

may quote by way of illustration the prayer assigned as a sort of thanksgiving before the close of day. Unfortunately it occurs in one of those portions of the document which have only reached us through the Ethiopic translation. As translated by Mr. G. Horner it runs as follows:

And he (the bishop) prays thus, saying: We give Thee thanks, God, through Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, because Thou hast enlightened us by the revealing of the incorruptible light; we having therefore finished the length of a day and having come to the beginning of the night and having been satiated with the light of the day, which Thou hast created for our satisfaction, and now since by Thy grace we have not been deficient of the light of the evening, we sanctify Thee and we glorify Thee through Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom to Thee be glory and might and honour with the Holy Spirit now and always and for the ages to come. Amen.¹

Here we apparently have *through* the Son and *with* the Holy Ghost. As St. Basil tells us, it was owing to a controversy raised on occasion of some departure of his from the common usage in the employment of these prepositions that he was led to write his treatise *De Spiritu Sancto*.

Recently when praying with the people I used both forms of the doxology, and one time ascribed glory to God and the Father *with* the Son *together with* the Holy Spirit, and another to God and the Father *through* the Son, *in* the Holy Spirit. Thereupon certain who were present suddenly accused me of having used expressions which were strange and at the same time contradictory. And you, chiefly out of regard for their good, or if they are quite incurable, with a view to the safety of such as were under their influence, thought that some judicious instruction should be published treating of the force of these syllables.²

Such subtle disquisitions were thoroughly in accord with the temper of the Greek mind in that age and with the whole atmosphere of the Arian heresy. St. Basil had some difficulty in vindicating his orthodoxy, though there was plenty of precedent for the variations he had countenanced,³ but according

¹ G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles*, pp. 160, 384. Cf. Von der Goltz in *Sitzungsberichte* of the Prussian Academy, 1906, I. p. 149; Schermann, *Allgemeine Kirchenordnung*, p. 85.

² St. Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, cap. 3. Cf. Lebreton, *Dogme de la Trinité*, 268-271.

³ St. Basil himself refers to Clement, Irenæus, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, etc. In the remarkable liturgical papyrus from Dér-Balyzeh which Dom de Puniet was the first to publish and which, according to Schermann, belongs to the third or perhaps the second century, we have a doxology which gives Glory to God *through* the Son *with* the Holy Ghost. See *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. XXXVI. 1910, p. 23.

to the testimony of Theodoret and Sozomen a great disturbance took place in Antioch about the year 349, in which those who instead of saying Glory be to the Father, *and* to the Son, *and* to the Holy Ghost, said Glory be to the Father *through* the Son, *in* the Holy Ghost, were believed to be convicted thereby of Arian opinions, denying virtually that the Son was equal with the Father. In the passage in which Sozomen gives an account of this dispute he lets us know that the doxology was recited at the end of the psalmody, and he implies that the form then long current among the orthodox was "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, Amen."¹ Philostorgius, on the other hand, charges Flavian of Antioch with having invented this form to replace the older "Glory to the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy Ghost." In any case a good many rather wild assertions have been made as to the origin of our present doxology. The earliest clear example of the form "Glory to the Father *and* the Son *and* to the Holy Ghost" seems to be that in the treatise *De Virginitate*, which has recently, after careful investigation, been re-vindicated as the authentic work of St. Athanasius († 373). The whole matter is obscure, and it would occupy too much space to discuss the details here, but there seems a great deal to be said in favour of the hypothesis of Dom H. Leclercq, who holds that the doxology first began to be connected with the psalms in the antiphonal singing, choir answering to choir, and that this originated in the Mesopotamian Church at an early date. It was a system which owed much to the appropriate adaptation of words to music, and the melodies and antiphons (used as refrains) of such writers as Basilides, Bardesanes, Harmonius, and finally St. Ephraem, had a great vogue. A fragmentary passage of Theodore of Mopsuestia records that Flavian and Diodorus at Antioch translated these antiphons from Syriac into Greek and thus virtually became the authors of this manner of psalmody throughout the Empire of the East. To this Theodore adds that

Certain heretics, that is to say the Arians, who hold that the Son is of different substance from the Father, were accustomed to chant thus, "Glory be to the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy

¹ Sozomen, *H.E.* III., 20; Cf. Theodoret, *H.E.* II. 19; and Socrates, *H.E.* III. 8.

Ghost," but Flavian is said to have been the first to chant "Glory be to the Father *and* to the Son *and* to the Holy Ghost."¹

As Theodore of Mopsuestia was himself born at Antioch before Flavian became Bishop of that city, it is quite likely that his account is substantially correct, and his language seems to imply that the doxology was used as part of the system of antiphons by which the otherwise monotonous chanting of the psalms was broken up and made responsorial. The fact seems almost to be established that the doxology included a second part and that the words ran then as they stand in the Greek Church to-day; viz.

Δόξα πατρί καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, both now and always and unto ages of ages. Amen.²

The existence of this second part is implied by the story that Leontius, the time-serving Bishop of Antioch, whose Arian sympathies were denounced by Flavian, was accustomed so to mumble the first part of the doxology that people could not hear whether he said "through the Son" or "and the Son" but only the concluding words "ages of ages, Amen." All things considered it does certainly seem to be a fact that the existing version of our little prayer (that with two *ands*), itself obviously based upon the formula of baptism, was originally introduced at Antioch in the fourth century with the distinct purpose of emphasizing the true Trinitarian doctrine and of counteracting the dangerous leaven of Arianism.³

Turning now to the Western Church it is by no means easy to determine when and under what circumstances the *Gloria Patri* was introduced. Mgr. Duchesne states very precisely and without any hint of uncertainty that at Rome

whatever the form of psalmody might be, it was a general custom, in the fourth century, for the psalm to end with the doxology:

¹ See Leclercq in *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie*, I. 2.284; quoting Migne, P.G. Vol. 139, p. 1390.

² The word *aiōnes* is interpreted by Westcott as "the sum of the periods of time including all that is manifested in and through them." *Ef. to the Hebrews*, p. 427. We commonly translate "world without end."

³ Theodore, *H. E.* II. 19. The fact that in the "Canons of Hippolytus" the doxology occurs in the form "Glory be to Thee Father *and* to the Son *and* to the Holy Ghost for ages, of ages, Amen," would be an additional reason for assigning this document to a later date.

Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto, sicut erat in principio et nunc et semper et in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.¹

This is, of course, the doxology now in almost universal use throughout the West. I am not aware upon what data Mgr. Duchesne bases this pronouncement, but he, like other scholars, attaches no importance to a certain spurious letter of St. Jerome to Pope Damasus in which the Pontiff is asked to enforce in Rome the continuous recitation of the Psalms both by day and night, and in particular to order that the *Gloria Patri* be added to each psalm as a declaration of the faith of the Fathers of Nîcea. Without attempting to defend the authenticity of the letter, Dom Bäumer is inclined to think that the tradition which it enshrines may not be altogether without foundation. A more trustworthy ground for argument is to be found in the language of Cassian († 440) who tells us, as one of the observations made during his travels, that in the East each psalm ended in silence with a prayer, and that the doxology was only used after the antiphon which followed a group of psalms; whereas in Gaul a single chanter recited the concluding verses of each psalm and was immediately taken up by the whole assembly, who vociferated in loud tones "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost." But what differentiated the practice of East and West even more sharply was the insertion by the latter of the clause "as it was in the beginning" which is wholly unknown among the Greeks. Despite the categorical statement of Mgr. Duchesne, quoted above, which declares that our present *Gloria Patri* was recited at Rome in the fourth century just as we say it now, I have not yet come upon any earlier attestation of the *sicut erat in principio* clause than is furnished by the second Council of Vaison, in France, which met in 529. The fifth canon passed by that assembly runs thus:

Seeing that not only in the Apostolic See but all through the East and in all Africa and Italy, on account of the subtlety of the heretics who blasphemously affirm that the Son was not from eternity with the Father but had a beginning in time, the words *sicut erat in principio* are recited in every conclusion, we also have decreed that the same form should be used in all our churches.²

The bishops who passed this decree were, of course, entirely

¹ Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 116.

² Maasen, *Concilia Ævi Merovingici* (M. G. H.) p. 57.

mistaken with regard to the East, but they probably had vaguely heard that the doxology was framed as a protest against Arianism, and not knowing anything about the earlier change from "*through the Son*," &c., they considered all the virtue of the formula to lie in the added clause "*sicut erat in principio*." It has been suggested that they must have supposed the meaning to be "As He (the Son) was in the beginning," but this does not seem a necessary inference. If the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity had been begotten in time, the prayer that glory should be given to the Son "as it was in the beginning" would involve a contradiction. Hence the generation of the Son from all eternity is indirectly affirmed. Further we may note that in one Western Church this additional clause has never established itself. In two decrees of the fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633) the form of the *Gloria Patri* is specially referred to. Basing its practice upon the language of Scripture (Ps. xxviii. 2; Apoc. v. 13) this Spanish Council prescribed that the recitation of every psalm should end "not, as has been the practice of some hitherto, with the words 'Glory to the Father,' but with 'Glory and honour to the Father.'" On the other hand the clause *Sicut erat* was not inserted, and the whole formula, as we may still read it to-day in the Mozarabic service-books, consisted only of the words "Gloria et honor Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto, in sæcula sæculorum. Amen."¹ Although the Council of Toledo does not speak of it, the recitation of the *Gloria* at the end of the psalm was apparently accompanied by a prostration. This at any rate was prescribed for monks by the rule of St. Fructuosus, who lived in the same country and at about the same time.

In all the prayers of every one of the Hours both day and night they shall prostrate themselves upon the ground at the end of every psalm singing *Gloria* to God but in such order that no one shall bow down or rise up again before the president.²

In the East also a prostration was made after each psalm, but this was usually accompanied by the recitation of a collect. In the Rule of St. Columbanus, and also in that of the Spaniard St. Donatus, a prostration was similarly made, but with the triple repetition of the versicle *Deus in adju-*

¹ Mansi, *Concilia*, x. 623.

² Migne, *P.L.* Vol. 87, p. 1101.

torium, &c. Some act of reverence would seem in any case to have attended the recitation of the *Gloria Patri*, as indeed the head is bowed when the words are said at the present day. Among Celtic peoples such prostrations, accompanied with the *cross-figil* (arms extended in the form of a cross), seem to have been held in special honour. Thus in the ninth century we have a curious story of the Breton ascetic, Anowareth or Anagareth, who apparently spoke nothing but his own native language.

Two of our Brothers [says a Benedictine chronicler] came upon him unexpectedly, and from a distance observing him throw himself repeatedly down upon the ground in the form of a cross, they thought that he must be out of his mind. It was, however, his custom, whenever on completing a psalm he began to say *Gloria Patri* and the rest, to prostrate himself straightway at full length upon the earth. This they discovered from his interpreter when on coming close up to him they inquired the cause of these incessant prostrations.¹

There can be no doubt that in the same ninth century much interest was taken in the doxology. The learned Walafrid Strabo, in particular, devotes to it the greater part of one long chapter of his *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*. His information, moreover, is surprisingly correct. He tells us of the Spanish peculiarity of singing "Glory and honour to the Father" and of omitting the *sicut erat*, he also informs us, quite accurately, that the Greeks likewise omitted the clause "as it was in the beginning," but retained "now and for ever, world without end." We further learn from him that they made the addition of the clause *sicut erat* a matter of reproach against the Latins, a reproach which Strabo repels on the ground that the Roman Church always drew its liturgical practices from the purest streams of ecclesiastical tradition. Finally, he informs us that it was stated by many that the doxology was framed by the Council of Nicea, as a protest against heretical doctrine, in a brief formula which could be conveniently introduced into many Church offices and which might win greater acceptance for the separate prayers of the faithful.²

Walafrid Strabo's rather vague language perhaps implies that the *Gloria Patri* was wont to be used for purposes of

¹ Mabillon, *AA. SS. Benedict* Vol. VI. p. 185.

² Migne, *P.L.*, Vol. 114, pp. 954-955.

private devotion, and this was certainly sometimes the case in the later middle ages, as it is also the case to-day. The practice of saying three Glory be to the Fathers, morning, noon and evening, has for more than a hundred years had an indulgence attached to it when this exercise is offered for certain specified intentions. On the other hand, as one slight illustration of mediæval feeling, I may refer to a story told by Cæsarius of Heisterbach in his *Libri Octo Miraculorum*. A certain Mechtildis, who was a Præmonstratensian nun, gave him an account of a vision which had been vouchsafed to one of the Sisters in her community. This Sister on the death of a friend had repeatedly recited the psalter for her soul, adding to each psalm a *Gloria Patri* with a deep inclination, probably what the Greeks would call a little *metanæa*. Soon after, the dead woman appeared to her to thank her, telling her that she had obtained an early release from Purgatory "on account of the honour which thou didst pay to the Holy Trinity when thou didst chant Its special versicle *Gloria Patri* after the psalms with a proper obeisance" (*quando versiculum eius Gloria Patri cum inclinatione decantasti*).¹

It only remains to say a few words upon the question of our existing English translation of the *Gloria Patri*. Three times at least within comparatively recent years—in 1884, in 1901 and in 1913—this translation has been made the subject of an animated discussion in *The Tablet*. On the second of these occasions the question was raised in connection with a letter by the late Mgr. Gerald Molloy addressed to the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, and in that magazine also a correspondence was started. But much further back than any of these protests, Dr. Lingard in 1833 sent a communication in the same sense to the *Catholic Magazine*. "That the English form is erroneous," he wrote, "and should be corrected, there cannot, I think, be a doubt." The eminent historian also suggested two alternative versions, keeping as nearly as possible to the words with which we are familiar. Of these it will be sufficient to note the second: "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, so be it now, and for ever, world without end. Amen." Of the thirty or forty different writers who took part in the discussions above referred to hardly one defends the existing version, and it is indeed indefensible. They quote many foreign versions

¹ Meister, *Libri VIII. Miraculorum*, II. 2.

—French, Italian, German, Spanish, Dutch—and show that there is not one which agrees with ours. Our translation, as is well known, is identical with that in the Book of Common Prayer, on which Dr. F. E. Brightman has recently had occasion to comment in his learned work *The English Rite*.¹ He, like Dr. Lingard, gives up the present rendering as quite erroneous, and points out that *sicut erat in principio* can only be treated as a parenthesis. It is curious, however, that of all the many contributors to *The Tablet*, &c., who have criticized our English Catholic translation, not one seems to have been quite alive to the manner in which this version came into being. The fundamental fact, which all apparently overlook, is that down to Henry VIII.'s breach with Rome, the *Pater, Ave, Creed* and *Gloria Patri* were all said by the people in *Latin*. Henry, however, made it a primary feature of his reform that these essential prayers should be taught to the children and also to their elders in *English*. The consequence was that the generation which grew up between 1535 and the accession of Mary in 1553, all of them learned their Our Father, Creed, &c., in the Protestant form, *i.e.*, in a version which differed hardly at all from that of the present Book of Common Prayer. When Mary tried to restore Catholicism, it was not possible to go back to the Latin originals, and on the other hand there was no authoritative Catholic rendering to substitute for that which was now familiar. Hence the people as a whole, whether Catholic or Protestant in sympathy, were content to adhere to the forms rendered obligatory in Edward's reign by the first draft of the Book of Common Prayer. In the case of the *Gloria Patri* no change at all was made, and the Anglican and Catholic versions, despite their extravagant inaccuracy, remain identical to this day. In the Our Father and Creed we Catholics have modernized a few words by substituting *who* for *which*, *living* for *quick*, &c., but otherwise it must be said that our Catholic children, by a curious anomaly, still learn their simplest prayers in those same versions which were prepared by the English Reformers in the sixteenth century to alienate our forefathers from union with the See of Rome.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite*, Vol. I. p. lxvii.

MARIGOLDS

ONE of the many benefits the war has conferred on us is that it has made life so liveable—so superlatively liveable. Just as the shadow, Pain, is inseparable from the sun, Pleasure, so is the fear of death inseparable from the fulness of living. From the war we are learning to live rather than learning to die, and as we die savagely, we live manfully, with joy of the doing running in our veins, even as the blood flows out.

In times of peace we lived in the conventional mean, with appetites half-awakened and mind dulled by routine, but now we have changed all that. In the midst of the engines of death we have learnt that there is joy in seeing, if but a solitary poppy on the edge of a shell-hole; in hearing, if but a cheap song wafted through the night to the accompaniment of tramping feet; in eating, if but a biscuit amid horrors; in the possession of muscles, if they but strain at the wheels of a mired-down gun. For all true joy is tempered with sadness, and happy is he who, wandering in the hills, has known the lash of rain on hands and face, and the buffet of wind flinging itself from the heights; who has known the sweetness of autumn, watching from behind warm window panes leaves flutter down to their winter's rest in the grass, and one by one the Marigolds dying.

No Marigolds grow in well conducted gardens, but this I have in mind was no place of terraces and sunken lawns, of sun dials from Oxford Street, and fountains turned on at a tap. Here grew whatever listed to grow, and we added, from time to time, exotics to that goodly company—poplars which as shoots we cut in Lombardy, and Marigolds, whose tender roots we raised from the soil of Gethsemane—happy little faces from the Garden of Sorrows.

Here came also many others. Through the shadows and lights of this place of weeds and gladness, children scampered, tearing their pinnies and knees, as holiday privilege; fat ducks from our neighbours' ponds waddled in search of provender, and smiling-faced fox terriers gyrated, their slim, red tongues adrip with mischief, and their sleek bodies dyed with the pollen of flowers.

Coming home was always a joy, and I think I loved it best in Autumn. As the train rushed out of the cutting towards the town, I loved to hear the wash of rain on the windows and the roar of brakes on slippery wheels.

Westward lay hills with the town beneath, and above, it might be, long clouds letting between their bars a savage white light, full of omen of bad weather, yet a light that shone as silver on wet fields and roofs polished with rain. I loved to have to turn up my warm coat collar and brave myself for the coming wrestle. I loved the stepping out from warmth to the wind-swept platform, the slamming of doors, the snorts of the engine, its steam flung across fields in wild arabesques, the newspaper flying after, and the silence when the train was gone. Then the walk home, the gutters of the hill-town all bubbling, cobbles glistening, and the horse and horseman trotting down. Then the warm house—a castle now indeed—kettle singing, the smell of hot toast, slippers in the grate, white plates and the great shining teapot. All these I loved; but above all, to peer into the storm-swept garden, to see the poplars blowing their graceful homage to the wind, all a-flutter with silver leaves, to see green vanish into green in the depths of the garden beyond, brick paths down which the leaves scurried as if afraid, and then the pitiful faces of the Marigolds bobbing and swaying to the will of the storm.

.

It is the element of chance offered by the war that makes life in it such an exciting thing to us soldiers. We hear much of the "Reaper" and the "Scythe," but the metaphor in this case is poor; to corn, stand it never so proud or never so golden, death is inevitable.

But to us, death may come, wounds and home may come, or life may go on. There is a chance for each, and, with sporting instincts working out in the flesh, we hope for a win or a place. The sweetest pleasures of life, of rest well earned, must be won through pain.

Of the general hideousness of this war enough has been said and to little purpose, since only by experience can realization be bought. If all the war writers of the world, with all the fountain-pens ever turned out, wrote till the Somme ran iodine, they could convey but a thousandth part of an idea of what it is like.

In this hideousness have I lived and enjoyed the living;

in this darkness I have seen light; alone in the midst of enemies I have found a friend; in pain I have found lasting comfort.

The morning after the great attack on X——, I found myself with my men occupying the remnants of a mill. The mill was not bricks, but the dust of bricks—it was, as a cheery soul said to me, “a metaphysical mill only.” We were weary, hungry, and bloody. The enemy were pounding us. The mud was engulfing us. *Dieu et nos droits*, together with plenty of ammunition, was all we had. I got my men’s rifles cleaned, inspected my position, and whilst cracking a joke with a stretcher-bearer, was hit. Suddenly the light of day was not; down, down I went into darkness, my own dreadful scream echoing in my ears, and there was the pain of a white-hot blade plunged through my eyes into my brain.

And then peace. Fear, anxiety, pain, even time and space faded from me; I lay at rest at the bottom of an ocean of darkness, my body stretched out, my arms crossed on my breast, my eyes lazily watching red weeds drifting by. Then I too drifted away, rocking slowly to the surge of the tide, and I felt then that I was dying, that I was passing out through the waters of death.

Seconds or aeons, since all were one, went by, and I drifted happily, only at times called to the surface by a voice, or when I heard my body asking questions. I remember crying again and again to know who else was hit, and then, “good-bye, boys”—now loud, now wearily, till I sank again. Once a voice, of my sergeant I believe, said, “He’s finished,” and at that my soul laughed. Then again I sank to my restful ocean, and time went by, till even my ocean was not. “I slept, methinks, and woke.” The voices of the stretcher-bearers came to me in my blindness, and I found that I could answer them, and I found also that I was not dying, not likely to die, and I laughed in myself that I was only blinded, for even then life was great and joyful. Once my bearers got fast in the mud, and I volunteered to walk, and walk I did, with my bandaged arms around the bearers’ necks, lifting my feet high lest I should fall; and I felt then the blood and mud on my clothes. The scene well I knew; the barren plain of slime and desolation, the long files of men going this way and that to their working or their killing. Often I knew that they had stepped aside to let me pass, and I felt their pitying glances, for often have I glanced and pitied. But

their pity was nothing to me; the tears of my body dripped down on the white-hot blade of my soul, bubbling up in laughter; blind was I, but I lived; blind was I, but my duty was done. Though we die savagely, we live manfully.

Then suddenly I went down again into darkness—I know now that days passed, that ambulances, stretchers, trains, clearing stations, white beds and windy spaces under the peaceful sky had received my body. Often I felt soft fingers at my face, but they seemed then as if the red weeds of my dark ocean brushed by me. Fingers touched here and there, and there were fumbings at my head and eyes, and sounds far off as of voices, and once I heard the tapping of a machine-gun and crash of bombs, all as toys, though indeed the hospital in which I lay was being raided from the air.

Then again I rose for a while out of the sea and floated at ease on its surface, and spoke to men, though their voices seemed more as the fluttering of leaves in the wind than as men's voices. I must have asked some certain question of one of the voices, for after a long silence, said one to me, "Are you from London?"

Said I, "Yes, do you know it?"

"Well, I know Farm Street."

"Then you are a Catholic!"

"I am a Jesuit," said the voice, and down in my soul I laughed again and praised God and gave Him thanks.

But the ocean of darkness became drear and cold, and often I drifted roughly and storm-tossed, and it became transparent, neither wholly of the soul, nor wholly of the body. I became lonely and miserable, and the knowledge of time returned, not indeed punctuated by day and night, since both were one to me, but punctuated by the pain of the daily dressing of my wounds and the spout of a feeding-cup entering my mouth. I became derelict of body and soul, since none spoke to me, and even I who loved life so wished that again I might drift out on the waters of death and this time come into harbour. So this went on, and often I wept both in body and soul, since all the light of both was lost. A blind man to others is a burden, and a blind soul a curse to itself. Indeed, I had forgotten that in storm weather I had loved the earth, and that through sadness I had come to joy. My pain increased, and there was much fumbling at my eyes, and often sounds of machinery close by, but none said a word to me.

And then the day dawned. My eyes received a stinging

pain, and a flash of light pierced them as lightning in a dark storm. Voices were all round me, and one said, "Can you see me?" but I could not, and then again, "Can you see those flowers?" and at that I forced myself and sight was given me.

Out of a blur of colour, in which swam smears of blood, there came to me the faces of flowers, near or far off I could not say, masses of laughing flowers, rich with sunlight, a sight of Paradise, swaying this way and that in a breeze from the sea. Their glory and their colour filled me, and I sank back on my pillows, echoing their laughter deep down in me—for they were Marigolds.

ROBERT L. HADFIELD,
2nd Lieut.

THE POSTULANT

DEAR God, it is as if I, from afar,
Thinking I hear You call me from my play,
Throw down my toys upon the nurs'ry floor,
And, running through the partly opened door,
(That Love Divine seems to have set ajar)
Search for You in my clumsy, childish way—
Not understanding, Father, where You are.

And, having found You, it may yet befall
That You will smile on me and bid me go,
Saying You did not call; then, for Your Sake,
I will lift up my pitiful mistake
To You—a humble offering, but all
I have to bring—and, Father, You will know
I came because I thought I heard You call.

RUTH LINDSAY.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

"UT OMNES UNUM SINT."

WE have called attention from time to time to the growing sense of the scandal of dissension which has become so manifest among the Christian denominations separated from Rome.¹ It has taken some time for these followers of Christ to recognize in practical fashion that their Master cannot have intended His Church to develop into some hundreds of sects, holding different and often contradictory doctrines. And now, stimulated by the needs of the times, the most earnest amongst them are diligently seeking a means of removing the scandal and reuniting that Christendom which the Reformation so recklessly dismembered. But three hundred years and more of error embraced as truth and truth repudiated as error makes their attempt, for all their goodwill, very barren of result. For some, "Rome" is still, if no longer crudely Anti-Christ, at least in many respects anti-Christian, yet "Rome" cannot be left out of the re-union projects, whilst the worst of "Rome" is that she is prevented by her very principles from acknowledging herself ever to have been or to be wrong in matters of doctrine. It cannot be otherwise, for she claims to have been supernaturally endowed by Christ with His own gifts of inerrancy and perpetuity. For an infallible Church to admit herself wrong on even one essential point would mean to commit suicide. So she cannot meet the others half-way, and all that Catholics can do in this matter, without compromising their whole position, is to labour earnestly to show that the Church is *not* a tyrant of consciences, a foe to liberty, an enemy of truth, a worshipper of idols, a dealer in magic, a corrupter of morals—is free, in a word, from the thousand evil qualities with which Protestant tradition has endowed her. Moreover, they must deal sympathetically with those who are so earnestly seeking for unity, as being manifestly under the influence of the Spirit of Truth. Such pleadings as those of Dr. Orchard in *The Outlook for Religion*,² which indicate so keen a sense of the inherent evil of sectarianism and a genuine, if still somewhat blurred, conception of the Catholic ideal as embodied in "Rome," are a hopeful sign of the times.

And a recent article in the *Contemporary Review* by a Protestant Professor of New Testament Exegesis³ is also significant, both as

¹ See "The Spirit of Union amongst the Presbyterians," *THE MONTH*, July, 1917; "Unity in Truth," *THE MONTH*, August, 1917, and *supra*, p. 381.

² Cassell, 1917.

³ "The Catholic Ideal," by Rev. T. Andrews, D.D., *Contemporary Review*, April, 1918.

regards what it presupposes and what it aims at. And it illustrates with what a handicap the truth-seeker, cut off from the source of revealed Truth, sets out, as we may here be permitted to point out.

First of all from his loose use of the terms "Church" and "Churches," we cannot tell whether he has our Church consistently in view. Certainly much that he says about "the Churches," as for instance, "from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century the Churches in England were for the most part engaged in formulating division," cannot apply to the Church of Rome, unless a steady maintenance of the standard of orthodoxy can be said to be formulating division. But implicitly at least he rejects our claim to be members of the Church of Christ: in fact, that ideal as sketched in the New Testament "has not as yet been really embodied in any Christian community," except perhaps for a brief period "in the time of Cyril" [of Jerusalem]. The Professor, in other words, thinks that Christ, to whom all power was given in Heaven and on earth, failed to accomplish His purpose of establishing the Church, that Church which He described under so many striking images during His mortal life. We have here the usual rationalistic view, popularized by Harnack, of the growth and development of Christianity, which ascribes its characteristics more to its changing environment than to the in-dwelling Spirit guiding its destinies according to the Divine Plan. Having thus denied to the Founder of the Church any foreknowledge of its future fortunes and any real ability to make provision for them, the Professor points out that the form and polity which the Church had to adopt, under stress of its environment, destroyed *de facto* its historic continuity. Contrary, we gather, to Christ's ideal, it formulated its doctrine and established its hierarchy. If only this had not happened before the New Testament was collected and received canonical approbation (so runs the argument) all might have been well. But alas! the teachers of the Church had got into the way of relying on unwritten traditions instead of the inspired Book: hence such evils as the Episcopal system with its claim to rule and to decide points of doctrine.

After his implicit denial of Christ's Godhead, this is perhaps the most singular fallacy in Mr. Andrews' historical position. It is, indeed, the old Protestant fallacy that a book by itself can be a rule of faith. This is, of course, the only alternative left when a living and infallible authority is rejected, but that does not make it less absurd. We did not expect to find it surviving in professorial circles, seeing that its fallaciousness is so conclusively proved by reason and experience. Reason tells us that only when a code of law or any other dead document can be made self-interpret-

ing can we ascribe to the Bible a like miraculous power; experience proves that appeal to the "Bible only" has merely multiplied the sects. Yet here is our Professor writing, "The Church failed to see that, when the New Testament was once established, it was the real guarantee and depositary of the Apostolic tradition." Is it not rather that *he* "fails to see" that the New Testament itself originally needed and still needs the guarantee of the Church, which alone can certify its authenticity and interpret its meaning? No formulary can have authority greater than or independent of its source.

Burdened, then, with these rationalistic presuppositions, the Professor turns to the New Testament in search of the Catholic ideal, which he declares no modern Church fully embodies. His rejection of oral Tradition compels him to assume that this collection of documents embodies the whole of Christianity. Setting aside the notion of permanent divine guidance, he imagines that the natural development of a living Body, increasing constantly in magnitude and encountering strange and varied conditions, is *merely* natural. He would not admit the argument that the fact of the living Church *being* so is a proof that God intended her to be so. He would drag us constantly back to the written record, and because no Church now retains the simplicity of ritual and of government natural to a new and small community he thinks that the Apostolic Church no longer exists. He allows, it is true, development, logical and consistent, of what is explicitly stated in the New Testament, but he holds strictly to the VI. Anglican Article—Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation. Yet even accepting that test it would be easy to show that the Church of Rome to-day is the same in all essentials as that adumbrated in the Parables and more fully described by St. Paul. The Sacrifice and the Priesthood, the Creed and the Sacraments, the doctrine of Grace, the principle of authority, the fixed "deposit" of Faith, the characteristic Notes of unity, universality and permanence,—these New Testament elements are and always have been integral parts of the Catholic Church of Rome.

On the other hand as he proceeds in his discussion the Professor himself deserts the rule of faith which he so emphasizes. He sits in judgment on St. Paul to whose authoritative writings he would elsewhere have us submit. "Whether Paul," he says, "was right and wise in all his statements remains, *of course* (italics ours) a matter upon which more than one opinion is possible." It is a cautious statement but it gives away his whole case, for, if Paul may be wrong, so may Peter and James, and so may Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Who is to decide which of the "possible

opinions" is right? The living voice of Christ's Church being ruled out, only the judgment of the individual on the silent Book remains.

Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.

It would serve no useful purpose to continue our discussion of this thoughtful article. Its chief interest for Catholics is the dissatisfaction it exhibits with the results of the Reformation. Whatever else that upheaval accomplished, it did not bring Christianity back to a lost Catholic ideal. The Professor enumerates from his study of the New Testament six somewhat vague characteristics which he thinks the Catholic Church should possess and which he is sure no modern Church possesses. If he would glance at the exposition of the Ninth Article of the Creed in our Catechisms—"The Holy Catholic Church"—he would find them all claimed in much clearer and wider terms for the Church of Rome, and shown to belong to her in fact. There he will find set forth in the plainest terms the Catholic Ideal he is in search of, for this Church alone answers his postulate of a Christian organization, which "adequately embodies in their proper proportion the great truths of the New Testament." And as for Catholicity, what other Church even pretends to be Catholic in time, place, and doctrine? The Professor may say that the Church of Rome teaches more than is contained in the New Testament, but he cannot deny that she omits nothing that is inculcated there, according to her interpretation of it: and this interpretation he must admit is at least as likely to be right as his. However, until he further admits that Christ, being Almighty God, founded a Church which He meant to endure unchanged in nature and doctrine to the end of time, and that therefore this Church exists even now, possessed of His authority, administering His grace and teaching in His name, he will never succeed in his quest for the "Holy Catholic Church": he starts by blindfolding himself.

J. K.

DO THE BLESSED REJOICE IN THE SUFFERINGS OF THE DAMNED?

WE have had sent to us a cutting from the February number of *Current Opinion* with a section marked that gives extracts from an article in the New York *Metropolis* by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. *Current Opinion* heads this section "The New Revelation from Heaven vouchsafed to Conan Doyle." From the extracts it appears that this well-known writer has been consulting the spirits and has obtained from them some detailed information as to the

nature of the future life, or of "the other side," as he calls it in true spiritistic language. From his language he appears to place as full confidence in what he has derived from that source as one does in the information regarding earthly events that are witnessed by the most authentic documentary records. On this, however, we wish to make no comment now, except incidentally to express our marvel that people who are so over-exacting in their criticism of the view of Heaven and Hell which rests on the testimony of the well-authenticated Christian revelation should be prepared to swallow down wholesale a rival account which, if the spirits consulted for it are really intelligent spirits, rests on the testimony of evil spirits as much set on deceiving mankind as ever they were. But in the course of the extracts come words which run as follows: "In this saving process [that is, the saving by the more highly placed spirits on the other side of those who for their ill-deeds are placed lower down] the higher spirits find part of their employment. Miss Julia Ames, in her beautiful posthumous book, says in memorable words, 'The greatest joy of Heaven is in emptying Hell.' Such a sentiment as that is certainly an advance in morality since the days when Gregory, Father of the Church, and called a saint, said that one of the joys of the Blessed was watching the torments of the damned." It is on this charge we wish to offer a word of comment, not with any special reference to Sir A. Conan Doyle, but because the idea suggested is one that sometimes causes distress and perplexity to kind-hearted Christian people.

We do not know much of this Miss Julia Ames whose ideas on heaven and hell are thus contrasted to her advantage with those of the great saint whom our forefathers venerated as the Apostle of their race. She does not at all events seem to be a very mature thinker. She is so set upon her idea of heaven emptying hell, that she cannot stop to inquire whether those invited thus to come up higher are prepared to come with hearts purified from their affection for past wickedness or are ready to rush in like the Harpies fouling everything with their impure touch, filling the atmosphere with their poisonous smell, and in fact turning heaven itself into hell. The writer who depreciates the morality of St. Gregory as compared with hers does not furnish a reference to any text of St. Gregory that we can look up. It is true indeed that several passages in St. Gregory's works make reference to his teaching on the attitude of Almighty God and of the saints in heaven towards the damned in hell, but none of them that we can find justify the interpretation that one of the joys of the blessed was *watching* the torments of the damned. We have no space

here for the full text of these passages, but those who may wish to see his *ipsisima verba* may refer to his *Moralia*, vi. cap. 30 (Migne, *PP.L.* Vol. 75, p. 755; *ibid.* xxxiii. cap. 140 (*PP.L.* Vol. 76, p. 691); *ibid.* xxxiv. cap. 20 (*PP.L.* Vol. 76, p. 739); and his *Homil. in Evangel.* 11.40 (*PP.L. ibid.* p. 1308—9).

To understand his meaning we may help ourselves with a supposition drawn from what is wont to happen among ourselves. A criminal who has been striking terror to a whole neighbourhood, some Jack the Ripper of evil fame, is at last caught, tried, found guilty on the clearest evidence, and is hanged, perhaps after having first been flogged. This latter feature is of course not in accordance with modern English jurisprudence, but we may put it in to heighten the picture. Justice has been done, and the consequent feeling in the breasts of most upright and well-balanced minds is one of satisfaction that iniquity has at last got its deserts. Perhaps there are among them some who had in their time been carried away by temptation, misled, it may be, by the criminal himself at a time when he had not as yet manifested the full lengths to which he was prepared to go. These were fortunately preserved from getting deeper into his toils by the warnings and exhortations of some good people, under whose wholesome influence they were won back to an honest and upright life. And these probably when they see or read of the conviction and punishment of the offender will feel a further satisfaction on their own personal account that they had been saved from the same punishment and infamy by their timely repentance and amendment. There might also be some in the country, sentimentalists, as newspapers like *The Times* would call them, who in their onesidedness and feebleness of judgment would say, as the day of execution drew near, "Poor fellow, it is a shame to treat him so cruelly, get him to promise to behave better in future, and then let him go free." And these latter in advocating their misguided view would be likely to speak in condemnation of the first and second class, as gloating over the anticipated sufferings of the criminal under punishment. But that would be misrepresentation, because what caused the satisfaction to these two classes would be not the suffering of the criminal *directly* or *in itself*, but this as a due requital of his guilty conduct. If the texts from St. Gregory above given are looked up it will be found that St. Gregory similarly speaks of the punishment of the damned as ordinary right-minded men would of the criminal in the case brought forward for comparison, though his terminology may not be that of a modern English writer. The further point that the Blessed in Heaven are described as being

without compassion towards the damned is the necessary consequent of what has been said. As St. Gregory puts it, whilst on earth the just were always showing their compassion by their prayers and other efforts to induce the sinners to have recourse to repentance and save themselves from the punishment that impended over them. But now when that time of probation is over which the long-suffering of God and the saving efforts of Christ had provided for them and repentance is no longer available there is no place for compassion any longer, and it becomes the friends of God in Heaven to conform their will and their wishes to those of His justice and judge of the wicked as He does. It is not by indulgence in the easy but treacherous reasoning of our feelings over circumstances that lie altogether outside our experience that we should allow ourselves to form our opinions, but by inference from the data with which revelation furnishes us, and for this reason let us not mind what anticlerical folk may press upon us but rely only upon the teaching of our faith, which has done far more service to the cause of human compassion than all the anticlericalism in the world. But let us help ourselves with this further thought. It occurs to none of us to conceive of the devil being thus in the name of Christian compassion admitted some day into Heaven. We have grasped so thoroughly the truth that that evil spirit is hopelessly confirmed in his malice, and that if he were to come to Heaven he would bring in all malice with him and convert the very happiness of that abode into misery. Are we entitled to assume that it is otherwise with the lost of our own race, and to feel sure that these at all events would repent at once and be transformed into Saints if the chance of a transference from Hell to Heaven were granted them? If such a thing were supposable some of our ascetical writers, if we remember right, have thought that God would then not deny them His grace. But the general belief, which some theologians have sought to sustain by philosophical arguments, is that such a change of heart after this life is over is not credible. At all events, since God has not ordained that there shall be such reversals of the sentence of eternal damnation, our soundest course is to believe that there is no place for them.

S. F. S.

MUDDLED METAPHYSICS.

IT is singular how the thinkers of the day, forced at last out of the complacent atheism and agnosticism in which they took refuge a generation ago, persist in regarding the God they are compelled to postulate as a Finite Being. To any one who has

studied the elements of Natural Theology as presented in Catholic text-books such a conception is merely grotesque. For reason cannot but assert that the Absolute and Necessary Being which the existence of contingent things demands must be Infinite in all perfections. If anything limited Him, He would not be the First and Sole Cause: again, to say that He lacked any actual or any conceivable perfection would be to say that He was not the One Self-Existent Being, for there would exist some perfection which He did not possess, or some perfection would be possible of which He was not the cause. This seems clear to the ordinary intelligence, yet so great is the mystery involved in the existence of evil, emphasized as it is by the colossal wickedness which has characterized the conduct of the present war, that many thoughtful men have rejected or cannot accept the idea of Goodness which is omnipotent, and have fallen back on the strange concept of a Finite God. William James was not a fool; nor, however bizarre their fumbings seem to us, should we class Mr. Shaw, Mr. Wells, and other amateur theologians as deficient in intellectual power, yet for want of a little knowledge of metaphysics, such men cannot rise above the conception of a deity, powerful indeed yet not all powerful, and similarly limited in other directions. To avoid what they think one contradiction they assert unconsciously a dozen others. They invert the natural process of reason which, having recognized the existence of an Infinitely Perfect God as being a logical necessity, is prepared and content *not* to comprehend fully the mystery of His dealings with His creatures. Instead of seeing that a perfectly just God cannot, whatever appearances may suggest, act unjustly with His creatures, they argue that He cannot be infinitely good or powerful, because they themselves, possessed of such attributes, would immediately destroy all evil. Robert Buchanan expresses this anthropomorphic view excellently in his well-known lines—

If I were a God like you, and you were a man like me,
And in the dark you prayed and wept, and I could hear and see,
The sorrow of your broken heart would darken all my day,
And never peace nor pride were mine till it was smiled away.
I'd clear my Heaven above your head till all was bright and blue,
If you were a man like me and I were a God like you.

Thus does man sit in judgment on his Maker, using that very moral sense, which is the reflection of the Divine Justice within his soul, to arraign and condemn God's Providence. Lacking the necessary knowledge on which to found a reasonable judgment, ignoring many points, such as the change in God's plans involved in the Fall, the institution of the Supernatural Order, the ex-

istence of Free-will, God's freedom from the limitations of Time and Space, the fact that He can do no wrong nor achieve logical impossibilities, and such like, and finally measuring his finite intellect against the Infinite, this purblind creature comes to a definite conclusion which implies a denial either of God's goodness, or of His power, or of His perfection. Until amateur theologians of Mr. Wells' school show that they have considered the problem in all its bearings, their judgments are of little value.

A writer in the current *Hibbert*, R. H. Dotterer, Ph.D., of Philadelphia, shows more appreciation of the nature of the problem but even he, owing possibly to his rejection of revelation, falls into the logical absurdity of positing a God "whose power is limited by necessities beyond His control." The inability of these writers to grasp the implications of their own theories is a striking proof of the danger of neglecting metaphysics. They fail to see that by postulating "necessities" superior to God, or "Veiled Beings" or, generally, the old conception of "Fate," they are merely moving the problem a step back and have to account for the existence of these finally omnipotent controlling agencies. Mr. Dotterer's article, which professes to clear up the mystery of God's dealings with man, ends by presenting the reader with a wild medley of self-contradictory hypotheses, which leaves the question indefinitely more obscure than it was when he took it up. And all because he cannot see the truth of two simple propositions, viz., that all contingent things must depend upon a necessary First Cause and all finite things upon a Cause infinitely Perfect. What prejudice is it that so distorts so many keen minds that they cannot work by the ordinary laws of logic?

J. K.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The Lichnowsky Revelations.

It is singular that the opening of what may prove to be the "last great battle of the West" should have coincided with a three-fold German revelation, which demolishes once for all the fiction that the Teutonic Empires were provoked to war by the aggression of ambitious and unscrupulous enemies. This colossal falsehood enabled the militarists of Germany to carry the nation with them from the beginning: it was endorsed by the Professors: it was embraced by the traders: it was taken for granted even by the Catholic hierarchy, no more enlightened in matters political than the members of their flocks. And now when the Teuton is

making his final bid for world-dominion, Providence has shattered even the semblance of moral support which this lie had hitherto given him. Prince Lichnowsky, the German Ambassador in London during the two years immediately before the war, has completely acquitted the statesmen who then ruled this country of any but the most friendly sentiments towards Germany. The German Foreign Minister at that date, Herr Von Jagow, has confirmed the main points of his story, whilst an ex-Director of Krupp's from a safe retreat in Switzerland, has directly accused the Kaiser of provoking the war for his own end. "Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just." Does this explain why, in this terrible March—April offensive, the Allied line has not been broken by the overwhelming forces thrown against it but has merely bent with, we may trust, the resilience of a steel spring? At any rate, whatever vagueness there may yet be regarding some of the Allied war-aims, we are still on the defence against aggression, and now, as ever, the German stands purely and simply for naked Force unbacked by moral Right.

**The Old
Diplomacy and
the New.**

Prince Lichnowsky's *Memorandum* is an artless document, intended as a personal *apologia* for his supposed failure in London. There is no question of its genuineness, though allowance must be made for the writer's natural bias. Without Von Jagow's endorsement of its main contentions and Herr Mühlton's description of the Kaiser's attitude, it would have lacked much of its indisputable force, which lies, not only in its disproof of Allied aggression, but in its showing how impossible it had become for the European nations outside the Triple Alliance to put up with the policy of an ambitious and conscienceless Power, which regarded war or "sabre-rattling" as an ordinary instrument of statesmanship. The Prince, Catholic though he is, is in thorough accord with this policy, which indicates that he has not thought out the implications of his creed. But, after all, in this point Germany was only carrying to a ruthlessly logical conclusion the spirit of the old diplomacy, which tended always to put national self-interest before justice. Lord Lytton, one of that old and now, let us hope, discredited school, actually devoted his inaugural address¹ as Rector of Glasgow University to proving that the rules of ordinary morality did not apply to international relations. And the atmosphere in which this immorality grew and flourished was the hidden character of international agreements. Now, since the Bolshevik publication of the secret treaty signed in London on April 15, 1915, with its famous, or infamous, Article XV. directed against the Pope, diplomacy, one might say, has taken to the megaphone. It addresses itself to the public

¹ On Nov. 9, 1888, quoted from *The Times* in Lilly's "On Right and Wrong."

opinion of the world, the final determinant of the international situation. In the chorus of speeches and counter-speeches those of President Wilson alone are clear, profound and consistent. The European Allies, hampered it may be by their private agreements and not at one in their ideals of justice, have not yet managed to speak with a single voice, as becomes the champions of a true and sacred cause. We trust that the President is speaking for them, and that he will go on emphasizing those principles of international morality, the holiness of which consecrates our struggle and makes martyrs of our dead. The substitution of law for violence, the embodiment of its sanction in a confederation of nations, the abandonment of national pretensions—inconsistent with impartial justice, the recognition of right as something moral and independent of relative might,—*importune, opportune*, the President reiterates these ideas amidst the growing appreciation and acceptance of all those who can think, not imperially, but in the spirit of Christianity.

**The Jingoism of
the Press.**

A section of the English Press, amongst which the *Globe* and the *Saturday Review* are notorious, "turns down" the President as a visionary, and are persistent in ventilating a godless philosophy about war, declaring its inevitability and all but declaring its necessity, and embracing with a—in the circumstances—diabolical readiness the consequences of this infidel view,—the race of armaments and universal and perpetual conscription. In the middle of the greatest crisis of the world's history, when the hearts of millions are being wrung by the results of an unutterably criminal ambition, these arm-chair militarists calmly predict a hundred years of more or less continuous fighting before the world settles down to an uneasy peace. The idea of a world without strife seems wholly abhorrent to them, and they call their brutal materialism "looking facts in the face." But there is one fact which they persistently ignore and that is, when the Allied democracies have broken the German military machine, they will not allow militarists of the *Saturday* type to devise another, in whatever quarter of the globe. Henceforward, as these worshippers of force will find out to their cost, those who have to fight will settle whether in the first instance there is to be fighting. "The people" at which this blinded caste are constantly sneering, will no longer provide "cannon-fodder" for irresponsible "patriots" to send to a horrible death in order to satisfy racial self-conceit or to secure safe dividends. Injustice will have still to be punished and aggression held in check, but international law backed by international force and embodying, let us hope, a formal recognition of Christian morality, will keep the peace with much greater success

and at much less cost of human life, than the barbarous expedient of war. Let us never forget, whilst stigmatizing the insane immorality of certain German militarists, that there are men of exactly the same stripe, few it may be in number and affecting only a few, writing and lecturing in our midst. Our statesmen might be worse employed than in repudiating them and exposing their immoral views, for it is *they* who are exhibited to Germany as the exponents of our war-aims.

**The Fruits
of
Autocracy.**

In spite of the Russian collapse and the consequent grievous prolongation of the war, the prospects of eventual permanent peace are much brighter for the disappearance of the Tzardom. One needs only to recall the blood-stained regime of that autocracy, with its endless crimes against elementary human rights in Poland and Finland and the constant menace of its lawless ambition, to realize what an incubus has been removed from Europe by its downfall. The American democracy could never have associated with such a system. Whether the Tzardom would have given much more help in the war is perhaps doubtful; it certainly would have made the establishment of peace more difficult. The only danger is that Germany should gradually take its place with tenfold its lack of conscience and efficiency for evil. For Kaiserism is only a more perfectly elaborated Tzardom: there was something paternal about the autocracy and its corrupt entourage: but nothing except ruthlessness can be expected from a military machine. The devil of Tzardom may be driven out but there are seven others even worse waiting to enter Russia, albeit she is only imperfectly swept and garnished. We are in danger of forgetting in our war-weariness the monstrous outrage with which the Hun began the war—the blood of a martyred and plundered nation with which his hands still reek. “Neutrality is but a word,” “Necessity knows no law,” “Treaties are scraps of paper”—the evil spirit that breathes in these utterances comes straight from the pit, and it has not yet been exorcised from the blinded souls which spoke or echoed them. Until God and His law are recognized as supreme over earthly concerns, unless God's rights in and care for even the lowliest of His human creatures are respected, the fight for the vindication of justice must go on. Justice has overtaken the Russian autocracy: poetic justice, for it is hoist with its own petard. But Germany's time is not yet. That is why the support of America more than counterbalances the defection of Russia, which, whether autocratic or anarchic, has “neither feared God nor regarded man” and could bring no blessing on any cause. America is the only one of the Allies that can state with truth, in the noble

words of her President, "We desire neither conquest nor advantage: we wish nothing that can be had only at the cost of another people,"¹ because in America the democratic ideal has reached its fullest expansion. If it is fated for America to finish the war, let us hope that she will be able to make that principle the basis of the future peace.

**Priests as Soldiers:
the Catholic and
non-Catholic view.**

The new Man-Power Bill raised once again the question of the exemption of the Clergy, but the proposed cancelling of that exemption was withdrawn by the Government itself on the sensible grounds that the inconvenience caused would not be worth the numbers secured. People naturally view this question of exemption from their own religious standpoint. Protestants generally, to whom the priesthood is not a sacrament (and these include the great majority of the Protestant clergy themselves), see no incongruity in a combatant priest and no great disadvantage in the temporary suspension of religious services which are not appointed channels of grace. These are somewhat aggrieved at the continued exemption, as conferring a privilege which circumstances do not justify. But the grievance is not a serious one, for if they belong to the clergy, they are free to volunteer even for combatant service, their superiors having made it open to them to enlist if they please. The Catholic Church, equally naturally, takes a different view of priests as combatants. Blood-shedding is regarded as abhorrent to the priestly character, so much so that voluntary homicide brings about "irregularity," *i.e.*, suspension from the exercise of sacerdotal functions, which can only be removed by judicial authority. Moreover, divine worship and the reception of the sacraments enter so intimately into Catholic life that the diminution of occasions means a serious moral loss to the faithful. Consequently, although the Catholic clergy would be willing to serve, were they really wanted, in the ambulance or other non-combatant ranks, they are precluded by their actual status from taking their place with the fighters. Those who quote the case of the French clergy, some 30,000 of whom are said to have been enrolled in all ranks and of whom 3,000 have already met their death, forget that they are fighting not as volunteers but under State compulsion, an unrighteous measure enacted long before the war, out of which, however, God has drawn untold good. How heroically they have submitted to a service not of their seeking nor in consonance with their state, is showed by the high percentage of deaths incurred amongst them. We may be permitted to add that out of 750 French Jesuits in the Army more than 15 per cent have lost their lives, while nearly all the survivors

¹ Second Inaugural: Mar. 5, 1917.

have won decorations of one sort or another. We have no doubt that a similar high proportion has been attained by other Orders, for the same spirit of patriotic devotion reigns in all.

**United Action
of Catholic
Federations.**

The outrageous attacks on the Pope which have stained the columns of certain English papers and in which we regret to see Mr. Kipling, writing in an American journal,¹ has joined, have had the good effect of promoting a united protest from the Catholic Federations of England and the States. Anything more wicked or more stupid than these groundless assaults on the greatest moral Power in the world, at a time when the Allied cause needs all the moral support it can receive, can hardly be imagined, and the Defence of the Realm Act may well be invoked to protect the Catholics of Allied and neutral countries against their repetition. We need not undertake anew the defence of the Holy Father's action against these crazy bigots. The course of events is bringing daily into clearer light the wisdom and correctness of his attitude. But we may cordially welcome the appearance of a second edition of that masterly explanation of the Pope's neutrality—*No Small Stir*²—which, written, our readers may remember, by a devout and conscientious Anglican layman, more than atones for the unworthy and ignorant sneers at the Papacy of the Anglican *Church Times*. The pamphlet has been thoroughly revised and brought up to date, and it includes a new chapter on the Papal Note of August, 1917.

**Annual Meeting
of the
C.T.S.**

The Government have found it necessary in the fourth year of the war to re-organize the department of propaganda, the object of which is to present the case for the Allies before the neutral as well as before the belligerent world in as striking and plausible a manner as possible, so as to sustain the morale of their own folk and to win the support of aliens. A similar necessity has always been incumbent on Catholics, members of a Church engaged in the perennial struggle for the cause of God's Truth. But Catholics have been even more slow to recognize it, if we may judge from what was said at the Annual Meeting of the C.T.S. on April 12th. Although the Society is perfectly solvent and is doing good work, its energies are grievously crippled, at a time when they could be more than ever fruitful, by want of financial support.

¹ The *Red Cross Magazine* for February. We may add that its editor has since handsomely apologized for publishing the bigoted innuendoes of Kipling's poem. See *America*, 23 March.

² The Society of SS. Peter and Paul : London, 6d.

Hundreds of its most useful publications have gone out of print and there are no funds wherewith to reprint them. The penny pamphlet has been reduced in size, but even so it can no longer be produced at a penny. The membership has slightly increased, but it still remains absurdly low, considering the importance of the work to be done. One would think that a Catholic community numbering (in Great Britain alone) 2,500,000 could furnish more than the bare two thousand names which figure on the C.T.S. membership list. This is less than half the total of clergy alone: it forms .08 per cent of the whole Catholic population! At this time when the minds and hearts of many are feeling the inadequacy of the non-Catholic presentment of Christianity and when many non-believers are seeking the support of an assured and definite faith, the activities of the C.T.S. should be enormously multiplied; its pamphlets—devotional, doctrinal, historical, ethical, social—should be playing their most essential part in the work of reconstruction. Will Catholics tolerate such an appalling shortage of munitions just when the need of them is the greatest? The Society has always and wisely kept clear of debt, it receives few donations, it makes little or no profit on sales, and is therefore largely dependent on the subscriptions of members (10s. annually: life-membership, £10). With a membership of twenty thousand or even of ten, its work for the faith, already so valuable, might be indefinitely extended. Cardinal Gasquet, who has honoured the C.T.S. by becoming one of its Vice-Presidents, does not hesitate to say: "I have always regarded and always shall regard the Society as doing one of the most important works possible for the Catholic Church in England, and its importance seems to me to grow year by year. We cannot do without it." Yet how many of the clergy and laity do manage to do without it!

**Low Views
on
Education.**

We called attention last month to the strange views on education expressed by a body calling itself the "Federation of British Industries," a capitalist organization reflecting the views of those who can conceive no higher ideal than industrial efficiency, and no better arrangement of society than the present. They are opposed to the Fisher Bill because it tends to lessen the supply of cheap labour. They regard the human child, first and all the time, not as an image of God but as an instrument of production. Good Christian men as they may deem themselves, they are atheists at heart, denying the sacred personality of God's creature and all the inalienable rights that depend thereon. At a time when their views were, not more unblushing but, more general—the mid-Victorian era—they were scathingly satirized by John Mitchell in the *Fail Journal*, who imagines the "Federation of

British Industries" of his day thus addressing the Carpenter of Nazareth:

Can you make anything, improve anything? You are, if I mistake not, a carpenter to trade, and have been working somewhere in Galilee: now, have you invented any improvement in your own respectable trade? Have you improved the saw, the lathe, the plane? Can you render the loom a more perfect machine or make a better job of the potter's wheel? Have you in any shape economized materials, economized human labour, added to human enjoyment? Have you done, or can you show the way to do any of all these things? No? Then, away with Him, crucify Him!

Over against the materialistic view of these tradesmen stands the grand conception of the Catholic Church, which has consistently taught the infinite value and dignity of the human soul, and its right to the due development of its faculties. To limit education by merely industrial needs, as the mammon-worshippers desire, is to perpetuate the un-Christian notion of an inferior race, born to labour for the benefit of others and unfit themselves for the amenities of life.

A Real Educational Difficulty.

So whatever difficulties are urged against extending the benefits of higher education to members of the working classes, let us set aside those which are based upon the supposed exigencies of trade. They are illusory in any case, for if employers were not so blind they would realize that an educated manual worker is more efficient than an ignorant one, and that an employee who has wider interests than his own particular job will be likely to perform that more intelligently. Even if it were not so, the man comes before the work. But there is an economic difficulty, arising from the fact that modern industrial conditions make parents unable to do without their children's assistance when they come to a wage-earning age. Hitherto children might be employed as "half-timers" between the ages of twelve and fourteen, at which latter age compulsory school-attendance ceased. Now there is to be no half-time and even after fourteen, part-time education must continue till the child is eighteen. The employers' grievance we may reject as selfish and avaricious,—can we say the same of the parents? This is a real and substantial difficulty, one which has led the Catholic Hierarchy to deprecate the extension of compulsion to this further period of education. It has seemed to them an undue intrusion of the State upon parental rights, taking from the working class the right enjoyed by the well-to-do of determining within certain limits the character and

amount of education their children are to receive. For the State to insist upon a higher degree of education than is sufficient to make the child a good citizen would seem to imply that the child belongs primarily to the State and not to the family, a conception which Catholics must always oppose. On the other hand, under present industrial conditions, this part of the scheme seems bound to fail without compulsion, just as elementary education itself would be neglected if the State did not insist upon it. If, then, the State insists on a higher standard, it must, pending a complete change in our industrial regime, compensate in some way the parents whom it deprives of their children's support.

**The Limits
of
Compulsion.**

There is doubtless a rational mean between the extremes of Individualism and State-autocracy, determining the exact amount of personal liberty and degree of personal rights the citizen may be lawfully called upon to sacrifice for the common welfare. But it is a mean very difficult to strike even in the case of a single individual; much more, therefore, in a society embracing a vast variety of characters and capacities. The problem is simplified in the event of a war such as the present, when the welfare of the State is narrowed to the one main end of securing victory. In this circumstance all exercise of personal liberty which would notably impede gaining that end may reasonably be suspended. In the case of a community divided in their opinions as to the necessity of victory or as to the best means of gaining it, considerable hardship may be felt owing to these restrictive measures, but the responsible authorities are bound to persevere in them in order to secure unity and efficiency. However, they will prudently allow a fair amount of hostile criticism as a less evil than unpopular measures of suppression. The rights they take away are more obvious and immediate than the advantages so secured, and some grumbling and resentment are inevitable. Whether the proposed extension of education, which might in normal circumstances be considered also an undue extension of State interference, may be considered a war measure, since the State after the war will need a higher degree of efficiency in its citizens, will be disputed. But the promoters of the Bill base it mainly on the educational interests of the child, which are certainly jeopardized by a premature application to manual or non-intellectual work. It is absurd to suppose Mr. Fisher to be aiming at producing or perpetuating the "Servile State." Still, he will do well and justly if he devises some measure of relief to necessitous parents or else another weighty motive will be provided for the practice, already too common, of family-restriction. A real "family" living wage, could that be secured, would be the ideal way, and to that end all workers at reconstruction must aim.

Toleration
or
Right.

A writer in *The Times* for April 24, on a subject with which we have nothing to do in these peaceful pages, gave expression incidentally to an idea which it may be worth while to expose and refute, since it is fairly common even amongst those who have most reason to resent it. He writes,—“She [the Catholic Church] is granted a tolerance in the British Empire which she would never be granted in Germany, a tolerance which she never shows herself in Catholic countries.” Every clause in that sentence contains or implies a falsehood, or at least a fallacy. The first implication is that the freedom of worship which Catholics experience under the British flag, is a gift from the State, not a mere recognition of a right. Why should not Catholics have exactly the same liberty in religious matters as non-Catholics? Catholics form one-fourth of the population of the British Commonwealth, but even if they were only one-twentieth or one-hundredth, it is merely justice on the part of the State to respect their freedom to serve God according to their consciences. If we take a comparative estimate, we may grant that Catholics are freer now than they were in persecution-times and freer here than in some other lands, and we may congratulate ourselves that it is so, but to thank the State for giving us what the State has no right to withhold would be to give some colour to the false charge that Catholicism is in some way incompatible with the full discharge of civil or political duty. The State, which is our State just as much as it belongs to other denominations, is not competent either to approve or to condemn our particular beliefs. Nor, being *de facto* non-religious, can it take upon itself to decide which religion is the true one, but it must recognize and protect all the religions which its subjects profess, always provided they are compatible with public order. Again, whilst it may be true that in Germany Catholics are more dragooned and disciplined by the State than in this country, they share that disadvantage with other denominations, and in one important particular, that of education, their rights have fuller recognition than they meet with here. The last statement is of the *ad captandum* order, and implies, contrary to fact, that the Church still dictates State policy in any country. Whereas the only intolerance the Church displays is the intolerance which truth must always show towards error and justice towards injustice.

It is time that Catholics stood upon their full citizen-rights and irrepelled with all their energies the inferior political status which intolerant Protestantism seeks still to force upon them. Our freedom of conscience is a right based upon our status as law-abiding citizens and not upon a revocable concession of a generous Government.

**Religious danger
of
Prohibition.**

A year hence Prohibition will come into effect in Quebec, and then the whole Dominion of Canada will be "dry." The motive force behind this steadily spreading measure, which is so serious a curtailment of human liberty, is by no means wholly ethical: it is very largely economic, and the war has given a great stimulus to it. A conference of Canadian women held at Ottawa in March urged the Government to prohibit the shipping of grain to England until this country gives up using it for brewing. And much feeling is aroused in America by the fact that the States find that they are stinting themselves in the use of cereals, only that the British may have more strong liquor to drink. However that may be, we are likely to be free over here from one consideration which Catholics under Prohibition would have to face and which has recently been much discussed in our American contemporaries,—that is, how "bone-dry" legislation will affect the celebration of Mass. Generally Prohibition concerns alcoholic liquors "for beverage purposes", but in Oklahoma and other Southern States the law prohibits the possession of such liquors for any purpose whatever. And the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the validity of such laws: the Federal Government will not interfere with them. Hence, many Catholics fear that in such States sacramental wine may be made unprocurable, especially if religious bigots get control of the legislature. A reassuring article in *America* for March 23rd cites a recent decision of Justice Brewer in the Supreme Court on a kindred matter which states as a fundamental rule that "no purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation of State or nation, because this is a religious people." The author regards it as inconceivable that "constitutional or legislative acts intended to prohibit the evils of intoxication" etc., will be invoked to interfere with Christian rites in a country whose civilization is based on Christianity. And his conviction is no doubt justified *rebus sic stantibus*, but there are many influences at work in America, as here, aiming at the destruction of Christianity. A civilization which tolerates divorce and permits Malthusians to teach their pestilent doctrines unchecked is not likely to show much respect for Christian rites if they stand in the way of its supposed interests.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Divorce, The Church and [Rev. James Hughes in *Catholic Gazette*, April, 1918, p. 63].

Extreme Unction according to New Code [Rev. M. J. O'Donnell in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, April, 1918, p. 286].

Gospel, The, and Peace [J. Bardy in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, April 15, 1918, p. 110].

Immortality [Dr. J. Vance in *Dublin Review*, April, 1918, p. 244].

Persecution, Religious [D. E. Brennell, M.A., in *Catholic Gazette*, Feb.—May, 1918].

Salvation outside the Church [Jos. Rickaby, S.J., in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Jan.—April, 1918].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Christian Science [H. Ollion in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, April 1, 1918, p. 47].

Interdenominationalism, Limits of [*Tablet*, April 13, 1918, p. 473].

Intemperance and Malthusianism, How to combat [M. J. Blouet in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, Mar. 15, April 1 and 15, 1918].

Pope's Action, The, and the Anticlerical campaign [*Civiltà Cattolica*, April 20, 1918, p. 97].

Vatican Council, The, from unpublished documents [F. Mourret in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, April 1, 1918, p. 36].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Canon Law, Importance of the New Code [Bishop Keating's Lenten Pastoral summarized in *Universe*, April 5, 1918, p. 8].

Catechism, One, for the whole Church [Rev. R. MacEachen in *Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1918, p. 249].

Catholics in the U.S. Army and Navy: High proportion of [Cardinal Farley in *America*, March 2, 1918, p. 513].

Church in China Yesterday and to-day [“A Worker for Prop. of Faith” in *Catholic Review*, April—June, 1918, p. 77].

Guild Idea, The [T. Maynard in *Catholic World*, March, 1918, p. 721].

Labour, The State and [Jos. Hesslein, S.J., in *America*, March 23, 1918, p. 595].

Liberal Catholicism [E. R. Hull, S.J., in *Examiner*, Feb. 2, 9, 16, 23, Mar. 2, 9, 1918].

Plunkett, Blessed Oliver, Account of [Dom E. Horne in *Universe*, March 28, 1918, p. 8]. Account of Beatification [*Tablet*, April 6, 1918, p. 448].

Russian Church, The, from 1905 to 1917 [Ch. Quénet in *Revue du Clergé Français*, April 15, 1918, p. 127].

Society of Nations, The Papacy and a [*Les Nouvelles Religieuses*, April 15, 1918, p. 225].

War and Christianity: Principles [M. Chossat in *Etudes*, Feb. 4, 20, March 20, April 5, 1918].

War Orphans, French [Y. de la Brière in *Etudes*, April 5, 1918].

REVIEWS

I—THE CONVERSION OF EUROPE¹

CANON C. H. ROBINSON, the Editorial Secretary of the S.P.G., has brought out a book on the *Conversion of Europe*. In his Preface he explains that, though during the present generation (whatever that may include) many books have been written on mission work outside Europe, not a single volume has appeared in England, America, or Germany on the missionary work of those who first Christianized Europe. Accordingly he wishes to supply this deficiency by his new book, in which, following a geographical rather than a chronological order, he tells of the conversion of the different races which inhabited Europe in those early mediæval centuries. He tries, though not always successfully, to be impartial, but what an alert reader cannot fail to observe is that he grasps but very imperfectly the realities of the situations with which he has to deal. It is this which leads him to the strange conclusion which he sets down in his final chapter: "We are constrained to thank God for the great army of missionary saints and heroes who lived and died inspired by the Holy Spirit, but our admiration for their lives and characters cannot blind us to the fact that the results of their labours fell sadly short of their ideals. . . . The conversion of Europe is an event which still lies in the future. . . . The methods by which Christianity was spread throughout Europe resulted in a superficial success which in many instances only fell short of complete failure."

What he means is that the conversions wrought by the early European missionaries were mainly effected by physical compulsion rather than by religious conviction and so failed to reach and mould the consciences of the populations reputed to be christianized. It is to this cause that he does not hesitate to ascribe events so far removed from European origins as the injustices and ferocities of the present war, which he considers could not have arisen had the Christian religion secured its proper hold on the populations engaged; and, if he indulges in the hope that, when the war is over, sickened by the horrors they have witnessed, the belligerents on either side will make common efforts to secure the adoption of Christian principles, he regards that prospective result as one which will be not so much a return to the Christianity of the past, as the taking up at last of that work of solid conversion which hitherto has not even been commenced.

¹ By Charles Heary Robinson, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ripon. Longmans. Pp. xxii. 640. Price, 18s. net. 1917.

This is surely a conclusion as unnecessary as it is paradoxical. True, there is a sad lack of Christian principle in many of those who are engaged in one way or another in the carrying on of the war, and most particularly is this the case with those who forced on this organized destruction of life in the sheer interest of their ambition to dominate everywhere. At the same time many bright examples have been shown of the truest Christian fortitude and faith in the numbers of those who are, and know that they are, fighting in single-minded sincerity for the defence of the highest objects. But whilst the causality of the latter class of manifestations can reasonably be traced back to the work of those who in a far back age were the apostles of Europe, the causality of all those manifestations of evil is more reasonably traced back to the systematic dechristianization of Europe which originated in the revolt against Christianity that arose in the sixteenth century and has been active ever since. The apostles of Europe did their work well, not all of them indeed on all occasions and in all respects, but substantially and on the whole. Of course there were also times and places when autocratic methods were employed of which it is impossible to approve. But Canon Robinson should distinguish between two modes of compulsion applied by these rulers to their subjects, the kind which is really chargeable with putting unlawful pressure on individual consciences, and the kind which may be called paternal, because of its resemblance to the methods followed by Christian parents in the training of their young children; who dictate to the inexperience of youth the system of belief and practice which they judge to be right for them, and which they in deference to their superior wisdom readily accept at their hands. It was this latter precedent which was followed by rulers like St. Olaf, if not perfectly at all events substantially, and which their unsophisticated subjects took so easily from them. Nor were such rulers departing overmuch from the precedents set them by right-minded parents, when they sought to protect their neophytes from the evil influence of those of their pagan neighbours who sought to corrupt them, by inflicting punishments on the latter which at times perhaps sinned by over severity. Nor again, though Canon Robinson does not seem to have thought it out, was it to be expected that those neophytes should at once grasp the implications of their new faith so correctly that the force of inveterate habit would never impel them to acts in themselves unholy or even idolatrous, any more than a father expects to find his son, whom he has caused to be baptized and religiously brought up, never led astray by youthful perversity into acts which give bad example or scandal. The Church, like the good parent, has always realized that Christian training which must supervene on the baptism of the neophytes, must be a long process requiring

much patience and forbearance in the pastors, and even then not always yielding full results in the most of cases.

A comparatively long section of the book is devoted to the question of the relations between the Christians and the Jews living in their midst, and the treatment accorded by the former to the latter during so many centuries. But here again the author exposes himself to the criticism that he has paid no attention to the underlying causes out of the conflicting action of which the disputes and grievances between the two sides arose; or to the distinction between the ill-usage which arose out of popular suspicions and took the form of popular insurrections, and that which was due to systematic and judicial action on the part of the secular or religious authorities; or again, between the treatment accorded to Jews who had always remained Jews by religion and that accorded to Jews who had become Christians but had afterwards apostatized, or perhaps had not apostatized openly but, whilst retaining office in the ranks of the clergy and even of the episcopate, were secretly using the positions thus acquired for undermining the faith of the Christian people. Not by these indiscriminating methods is it possible to write useful history.

2—A NEW BOOK ON HORACE¹

THE determination of the Classicists to justify their lore as an integral part of liberal education is illustrated not only by such works as that of Father Henry Browne's, reviewed in our last issue, but equally strikingly by the learned essay on Horace, lately issued by Father J. F. D'Alton, Professor of Ancient Classics at Maynooth, and called *Horace and His Age*. Father D'Alton expressly sets himself to invest the study of the ancient poet with that human interest that mere grammarians and connoisseurs of language are apt to overlook. His sub-title, "A Study in Historical Background," indicates the scope and purpose of his work. With that end he endeavours to reproduce, as far as can now be done, the whole "atmosphere" in which the poet lived, the politics, religion, philosophy, social ideals, theories of art and literature and ultimate beliefs of the Augustan Age at Rome. He is aware of the immense difficulties in doing so and the necessary imperfection of the best achievement, but he rightly holds that in no other way can the work of the poet be thoroughly appreciated. Hence with an almost Teutonic minuteness he traces the reflections of the times to be found in Horace's not very copious output, and discusses at the same time the new lights which a knowledge of the historical and social *mise-en-scène* throws upon the meaning of the text. The result is a very thorough study of the Roman life and thought

¹ *Horace and His Age: A Study in Historical Background*. By J. F. D'Alton, M.A., D.D. London: Longmans. Pp. xii. 296. Price, 6s. net.

of the period, invaluable to the student of Latin literature. From the mere fact that citations in full of the illustrative passages would have vastly increased the size of the volume, it will remain a book for the student who has the leisure and diligence to look out the innumerable references for himself. The actual amount of such references, not only to Horace himself but to other classics and the general field of Horatian literature, is an eloquent testimony to the depth and extent of Father D'Alton's scholarship.

3—CANON SHEEHAN¹

A FULL-DESS biography of the distinguished author of *My New Curate* has long been a desideratum, for he died in October, 1913. This has at last been happily supplied by the competent pen of Father H. J. Heuser, the Editor of the American *Ecclesiastical Review*, in the pages of which the famous story originally appeared. Father Heuser has done his work very thoroughly, and has drawn the career of his subject from the records of his contemporaries, from reports of his personal friends, and most of all from the priest-novelist's own writings—diaries, letters and novels—which are a faithful reflection of his experiences. From abundant material, the author, whose own literary skill is evident on every page, has woven a most interesting tale, contemplating his subject in the changing conditions of his life and introducing many details about persons and institutions that influenced him. It was an uneventful career as far as outward happenings go. An education at a diocesan college followed by a three years' course at Maynooth, then ordination (in 1875), and service on the English Mission for two years, after which curacies held at Mallow, his native town, and Queenstown, before the appointment in 1895 as Parish Priest of Doneraile. It was there that during the next fifteen years he wrote and published the fifteen volumes on which his literary fame securely rests: hitherto he had been content with articles in magazines, which indeed were numerous and varied enough to give sure promise of his later activity. For active parish work in towns his health was a poor second to his zeal: here in this small country town, with two curates to help him, he could do more with less strain. And from the beginning, although his natural tastes and ability, as well as outside influences, called him persistently to a literary career, his parish came first and foremost. There are many who, whilst appreciating the copious details of his literary labours during his life at Doneraile, given in Part II., will find still greater interest and edification in Part III., which deals with his pastoral life, his labours in the cause of education, his socio-political activities and his more purely eccle-

¹ *Canon Sheehan of Doneraile*. By Herman J. Heuser, D.D. London: Longmans. Pp. xix. 405. Price, 14s. net. 1918.

siastical work. And although through his books he exercised a true apostolate, enlightening outsiders as to the truth and beauty of Catholicism and stimulating the faithful to make better use of their heritage, he looked upon his church and his schools, his converts and his confraternities, as his chief interests, although they brought him no worldly fame.

The book is fascinating reading throughout, even though we miss the intimate touches with which a residence in Ireland and a more prolonged acquaintance with its subject would have enriched it. The Canon's views of his country's history and destiny may seem to some unduly pessimistic, and his literary tastes, widely cultivated though they were, do not always strike one as thoroughly well-balanced. But Canon Sheehan has given us "Daddy Dan" and many another masterly study of the Faith, energizing wonderfully in a land that never lost it. He has given us more than that, in the record of his own zealous, self-sacrificing, God-inspired life. We owe his biographer a deep debt of gratitude.

4—THE ORIGINS OF CONTEMPORARY PSYCHOLOGY¹

THIS little volume gives to English readers who just now for extrinsic as well as intrinsic reasons are attracted to the study of Cardinal Mercier's philosophical works, a little treatise the first edition of which came out as far back as 1897. Still it was well worthy of an English translation on account of its fundamental character. For not only is it a masterly analysis of the system of Descartes, but it shows how it was the fatal tendencies inherent in that system which gave birth to the long series of hopeless systems since propounded that go by the name of modern philosophy. Cardinal Mercier in this treatise, as he tells us in his short Preface, addresses himself specially "to those who are no longer satisfied with the standard spiritualism" and aims at leading such persons to institute a comparison between the philosophy of Descartes, the chief founder of official spiritualism and the anthropology of Aristotle and the Middle Ages, in other words, the anthropology to which he has given the name of Neoscholasticism, and which under that name has been studied with such instructive results at the Cardinal's own University of Louvain.

By standard spiritualism the Cardinal means the system of Descartes, who confined his psychology to the investigation, through the medium of consciousness, of the thinking soul alone and left out of account altogether those other manifestations of human life which cannot be associated with thought, such as the nutritive processes of digestion, of the circulation of the blood, or

¹ By Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines. Translated by W. H. Mitchell, M.A. London: Washbourne. Pp. xii. 351. Price, 6s. net. 1918.

again the processes of seeing, hearing, and imagining. These Descartes referred to the body within the sphere of which everything acts mechanically under the influence of motion ruled and directed by the organization of the material parts. What then is the nature of the bond which binds soul and body together? For that the two are thus united is clear from the fact that when the body is injured in some of its parts the soul feels pain. Descartes fully acknowledged that it was so and depicted to himself the soul as seated in the pineal gland whence like a head-workman it set the whole system of the body in motion and kept it thus going. But when pressed for a further explanation of the manner of this guidance or control, he confessed himself unable to give it and pleaded that the process was involved in mystery and could be known only by God. The Cardinal in this little volume traces the course by which out of this exclusive spiritualism of Descartes sprang the Occasionalism of Malebranche, and the Pantheism of Spinoza, while from the mechanical side of the system were derived the various forms of empiricism and positivism of Locke; also how alike from the spiritualistic and the mechanical side were eventually derived systems of idealism, such as those of Kant and his numerous progeny, who approached the question from the side of some system of mental laws, or Hume and Mill, who approached it from the side of sensationalism. In another chapter the Cardinal examines the systems of contemporary writers who have derived their fundamental principles from Descartes, taking Spencer, Fouillée and Wundt as representatives in this respect of English, French, and German thought. Here he is particularly instructive, especially in his examination of Wundt's system, inasmuch as Wundt is one who, though unable to extricate himself from the toils of Descartes' fatal theory of the relation of the soul to body, has glimmerings of the truth which Scholasticism alone seems to have seen and preserved, the truth that man is a being compounded of two principles, soul and body, the one immaterial, the other material, but principles that do not subsist independently of each other, so as to act each on the other as distinct agents, but are so united as to constitute a single subsistent being in the constitution of which the soul is "the substantial form of the body." In his last chapter the Cardinal expounds this famous Scholastic Theory.

5—MR. WILFRID WARD'S LAST LECTURES ¹

IN the winter 1914—5 Mr. Wilfrid Ward delivered the Lowell Lectures at New York, choosing for his subject the Genius of Cardinal Newman as one which was not only of special interest

¹ *Last Lectures by Wilfrid Ward.* With an Introductory Study by Mrs. Wilfrid Ward. London: Longmans. Pp. lxiv. 295. Price, 12s. 6d.net. 1918.

at the time, but one on which his own labours as the Cardinal's biographer gave him a peculiar title to speak. He intended these lectures for eventual publication, and was hard at work on their revision for this purpose when the breakdown of his health constrained him to leave the task unfinished. It would have been a pity if a work so discerningly and delicately executed had been lost to the world, but his wife and daughter, by careful examination of his MSS. and some notes left upon them, which indicate what he meant to revise or alter, have been able to bring out the whole almost exactly as he intended it. They have also added to the collection three other lectures on "The Methods of depicting Character in Biography and Fiction," which were delivered shortly after at the Royal Institution, together with three essays, on Mr. Balfour's Gifford Lectures, on the War Spirit and Christianity, and on Oxford Liberalism and Dogma, which in his last days of health had appeared in the *Fortnightly* and *Edinburgh Reviews*. In an Appendix is further added the text of a Memorial to Mr. Ward, with the full and representative list of signatories, Catholic and non-Catholic, which was collected and presented to him by Mgr. Stapylton Barnes in the spring of 1915, when rumours were abroad that his editorship of the *Dublin Review* was about to terminate—a memorial which gave him great but well-merited gratification.

In thus preparing and publishing these Last Lectures Mrs. Wilfrid Ward and her daughter are fully justified in thinking that they have given to the world "the completion and rounding of the work of a lifetime," for, though they were not intended by him as such, being written at a time when he could still hope for several more years of active life, they do by their subject matter and the ripe experience in that field of literature they embody form the crown to a life's work which has been not inaptly defined by Professor Michael Sadler in a letter written to Mrs. Ward since her husband's death: "He did a very great work for the religious life of the nation, as did his father before him. He was one of those who represented to us in the Church of England the Catholic tradition. He was what we have learnt to call in our English administration a liaison officer, one who links together by his knowledge, sympathy and wisdom, many who would be otherwise apart, and helps them to work together for the common good." One can trace this ruling thought in all that Mr. Wilfrid Ward did or wrote; one can trace it too in the effects of his writing, for there are many who would agree with Professor Sadler in testifying that he had aided them to see how much there is in Catholic thought and belief, which when thus interpreted evokes their assent or attracts their sympathy, whilst on both sides we shall readily admit that this, which was in Newman too so strikingly, is indeed the very best form of apologetics. There are dangers in the path of such mediators, who are wont

to be misunderstood on one side or the other, and Mr. Ward had to suffer somewhat in this way, and even to get labelled for it, though, as we have all along felt, very unfairly. That, however, is a thing of the past, and we only refer to it in passing in order to draw attention to Mrs. Ward's biographical introduction and as bearing signal witness to his absolute loyalty to the Church of which he wished to make himself the apologist, and of the solicitude with which, at great labour often to himself, he sought ever to ascertain what her sound doctrine in subtle cases was in order so to represent it. "His last communion," says his widow, "was of extraordinary joy to him; his reserve on spiritual matters was wearing thin. I don't think he knew what he was showing. His voice was failing, but he kept saying, 'Thank God. How wonderful!' And once he added, 'No one knows what it is to be a Catholic.'" It was a fit ending to a life which had been so consistently dedicated to the work of manifesting Catholicism to others.

In the Lowell Lectures he takes to task the singularly mistaken appreciations of Cardinal Newman's genius formed by some of the reviewers of the biography. These critics distinguished between Newman's literary style, which they acknowledged to be that of a master if not unequalled, and his thought on philosophical, historical, and other matters, which they set down as distinctly poor and lacking in acquaintance with the needful erudition. Mr. Ward, in a study of remarkable thoroughness and insight, shows how in Newman more perhaps than in anyone else the style was the man. "Many essays which [the critics] call 'controversy' contain the impress of Newman's mind and soul, the record of an eventful personal history and experience, which is the main source of all that is recognized as so beautiful in his style. The style faithfully reflects the journey of his life-mind in its various stages. The austere severity of his earlier and tentative inquiries gave place to the peculiar beauty and persuasiveness of his presentation of the vistas that opened out before his mind as time went on." Nor is the ground any surer for the suggestion that he did not bring much intellect to bear upon the thinking out of the questions on which he wrote. On the contrary few of those who pass for learned philosophers or historians have thought out their points so searchingly, so lovingly, as he. But he had religion in view primarily in all that he wrote, and he was anxious about this only, and had no attraction for the dry-as-dust ways of some of the expert philosophers and historians.

In his Royal Institution Lectures Mr. Ward has left us what is really a most valuable grammar on the art of depicting character and the extent to which a man's correspondence can be drawn upon for this purpose. Very suggestive, too, for the present time is his study, in his article on the War Spirit and Christianity, of the modern doctrine of self-realization in its contrast with the Christian doctrine of self-denial.

6—DARRINGTON PARISH¹

ANY author of antiquarian tastes who elects to write an account of an out-of-the-way tract of rural Yorkshire subjects himself to an inevitable handicap. His work cannot fail to suggest comparison with Dr. Atkinson's *Forty Years in a Moorland Parish*, and the merits of that delightful monograph are such as to threaten virtual extinction to every rival that presumes to come into the same field of view. We can hardly pay Mr. J. S. Fletcher a greater compliment than to say that his book on Darrington has enough of literary charm to survive the ordeal. It has not, perhaps, the spontaneity of Dr. Atkinson's volume; it is altogether slighter in construction, it lacks those admirable chapters on animal and bird life which are so striking a feature in the older work; moreover, it sometimes gives the impression of a rather exceptionally skilful bit of bookmaking, but none the less the reader succumbs to the spell which Mr. Fletcher's experienced pen is deft enough to weave. He does not lay the book down, although he is conscious that the matters and persons discussed are of no very great consequence in themselves, and that the manner of treatment is not exactly novel. It is the historical side of his subject upon which Mr. Fletcher lays most stress. He takes us back to Roman times, discusses the changes introduced by the Roman Conquest, discourses pleasantly enough, not without acknowledging considerable obligations to the late Dr. Augustus Jessop, upon the builders of parish churches and the preaching of the friars, he comments with appropriate severity upon the violent methods of the Reformation, and he has evidently bestowed a good deal of painstaking study upon the parish registers and similar sources of information belonging to the later centuries. There is an interesting chapter on "Farmers and Farming in the 18th Century," another on "The Agricultural Disaster" which befell the district within recent times, there are sketches of highwaymen, and of the Methodist revival, of racing and the coaching days, as well as of "Church Life" since the Reformation. Finally the leading families of the neighbourhood are pleasantly dealt with, many of them being Catholic, and there are several charmingly drawn illustrations, not to speak of a good index. Altogether the volume is extremely good of its kind and its literary presentment beyond praise.

¹ *Memorials of a Yorkshire Parish*. By J. S. Fletcher. London: John Lane. Pp. xix. 225. Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1918.

7—TWO VIEWS OF GRATTAN'S PARLIAMENT¹

ONE of the chief results of establishing a National University in Ireland has been, as was to be expected, a revival of interest in purely Irish studies, and a consequent re-writing of Irish history, which has rarely hitherto received a treatment combining science with sympathy. Only of late years, moreover, have the sources been completely laid open by the publication of various historical papers, especially the correspondence of officials, some of which have still to be thoroughly digested. Much valuable work has already been recorded in the pages of our learned contemporary *Studies*, and there are indications that many common views will have to be revised in the light of new facts. Professor Corcoran's paper on "The English Colonial Parliament at Dublin," in the March issue, suggests by its very title a new conception of Grattan's parliament, which, although composed of ascendancy Protestants, has been generally regarded by Irishmen as patriotically devoted to the interests of their country. But after Professor Corcoran has done with it we can readily understand the indifference with which the majority of the people regarded the Union. For them it was but a change of oppressors, and the more distant oppressor was the milder of the two. From the very first Grattan's Parliament showed itself hostile to the just claims of Irish Catholics and indifferent to Irish prosperity. Its independence, so loudly proclaimed, was practically nullified by the veto on its legislation allowed to the English Privy Council, a veto freely exercised. It steadily opposed every effort made by the Catholic people to gain some measure of political power in their own land, and when Pitt, in 1791, urged the House "to give a favourable ear to their [the Catholics'] fair claims," Grattan replied in a letter to his Protestant constituents (*italics ours*): "I love the Roman Catholic; I am a friend of his liberty, *but it is only in as much as his liberty is entirely consistent with your ascendancy and an addition to the strength and freedom of the Protestant Community.* . . . I shall never assent to any measure . . . to subvert the Protestant ascendancy." So determined was this bigoted attitude, and so scurrilous the treatment accorded by this body to the Catholic claims, that the Catholic leaders, after 1792, turned their attention to Pitt in England, the real master of the "Independent" Irish Parliament, and negotiated with him for relief. So it happened that the chief opposition to the Union came from the Protestant Ascendancy,

¹ *The English Colonial Parliament at Dublin.* Article by Rev. Professor T. Corcoran, S.J., in *Studies* for March, 1918.

The Last Independent Parliament of Ireland. By George Sigerson, M.D. Dublin: Gill and Son. Pp. xxxv. 207. Price, 5s. net. 1918.

who feared to lose their powers of plundering the country on whose neck they were fastened.

Professor Corcoran, once more, dissipates the prevalent legend that Irish trade was fostered by the Colonial Parliament and destroyed later by the English. He shows that the real cause of the ruin of Irish industry was the iniquitous Penal Code, which forced into poverty the bulk of the population and prevented their emergence. The brief splendour which Dublin showed during that period was maintained on ruthless rack-renting of the peasantry. "The thoughts and deeds of these Colonists," concludes the Professor, "were not Irish: their *Kultur* was not Irish, or indeed even human; they had, said Bishop Berkeley, 'Vulturine beaks and bowels of iron.'" They were aliens in that fair island whose last really independent Parliament was the Confederation which sat at Kilkenny in 1642.

After reading Professor Corcoran's paper, one hardly knows how to treat Dr. George Sigerson's history of *The Last Independent Parliament of Ireland* (Gill & Son: 5s. net), which follows the traditional view. He dissociates Grattan from the Ascendancy party, for he in 1795 brought in an Emancipation Bill, whereas one of the first Acts of his Parliament was to re-enact those provisions of the Penal Laws which, having been imposed by England, were annulled by the separation of the legislatures. There can be no doubt, we suppose, that Grattan was a sincere lover of liberty and of his country, but by liberty, as he himself declares, he meant Protestant Ascendancy, and his nation was the Anglo-Protestant Colony that exploited the mere Irish. Dr. Sigerson does not, it seems to us, sufficiently recognize this fact. However, the bulk of his book is devoted to a general sketch of Irish constitutional history and of the scope and effects of the Penal laws. And however imperfect the "Independent" Parliament was, there can be no doubt of the flagrant injustice of its corrupt abolition. That unsavoury story is told in full detail, and the terrible atrocities of '98 are recalled. Not, as it may be thought, unnecessarily, for contemporary Ireland cannot be understood except in the light of the past, nor can purer political methods and a high national ideal be professed without a contrite recognition of previous shortcomings. In Dr. Sigerson's book the English reader, especially if he is a Catholic, will find much matter for salutary reflection.

In regard to the commercial prosperity which coincided with the period of Grattan's Parliament, it is fair to add that Dr. Sigerson adduces much evidence of its reality, and indeed of the superior wisdom shown by many Irish trade regulations and methods, particularly with reference to the Fishing Industry, on which there is a valuable Appendix.

8—CHILD SAVING¹

THE appalling slaughter of the battlefield has compelled attention to a feature of our civilization which nothing but the general absence of a social sense in the average man and woman concealed from us during times of peace, that is, the vast extent of avoidable infant mortality amongst our population. Last October we reviewed two large volumes concerned with the state of things in England and Wales, which, owing to the munificence of Mr. Carnegie, have been published, in order to give social reformers an exhaustive idea of the work that awaits them. Now the same service has been rendered to Scotland by the Carnegie Trust in a finely produced volume, replete with maps and illustrations and compiled by Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie, Medical Member of the Local Government Board for Scotland. It is a model of its kind, thorough, scientific, yet full of sympathetic appreciation of the human interest of the subject, carefully recording what has been done to remedy evil conditions and frankly exposing a multitude of deficiencies. The whole record is a strong indictment of our industrial conditions which produce such an uneven distribution of the means of subsistence. The main cause of the excessive loss of child-life is bad housing and environment, which affect mother and child alike. Even before birth the child's chances are jeopardized, when the mother cannot afford to rest from work or lives in wholly insanitary conditions. The vast and growing apparatus of health-visiting, infant-welfare centres, institutions of mother-craft, school-clinics, etc., admirable as it is in intent and useful in effect, is merely palliative. The evil lies in the unhuman character of the worker's "home," whether in town or country. But until there is a radical and drastic reconstruction of industrial conditions, until the worker gets a "family" living-wage, can rent or own a decent dwelling, has leisure for self-development and opportunities for healthy recreation, until higher ideals than the mere pursuit of money and animal pleasure are created and made accessible, we must be content to employ superficial remedies to this deep-seated disease. And we shall have to put up with what in normal conditions would be an intolerable infringement of personal and parental rights, incessant interference on the part of various officials, civil and national, with domestic affairs, occupations, and even amusements. There are those who think that a *laissez-faire* policy, which at any rate respects human freedom and responsibility, is better than the schooled and disciplined servitude of the Eugenist, with its destruction of individuality and its aboli-

¹ *Report on the Physical Welfare of Mothers and children. Vol. III. Scotland.* The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust : Dunfermline. Pp. xxviii. 625. 1917.

tion of home life, but the organized State whose function is to insist on decency and order in the common interest cannot take that view. It must step in and take the place of conscience when conscience is inoperative: the mischief is that it does not step in soon enough and check the evil at its root in the action of the rich and conscienceless for whose welfare it is thought necessary that the multitudes should live in squalor and destitution.

A similar Report on Ireland is, we understand, in preparation. From that we expect much further enlightenment on this most important subject, the first in the material order to engage the attention of the social reformer.

SHORT NOTICES

THEOLOGICAL.

FATHER JOSEPH C. SASIA, S.J., has produced an arresting and unconventional book upon a grave subject in *The Future Life, according to the authority of Divine Revelation, the dictates of Sound Reason and the general consent of Mankind* (Benziger Brothers: \$2.50). It is a treatise *de novissimis*, illustrated from the literature of all time, discussing the End of Man, his responsibility to God, the sanctions of the divine law, the immortality of the Soul, the judgment to come, the eternal retribution, both remunerative and punitive. To an age grown blind through doubt, and soft through self-indulgence, this fearlessly-stated Catholic doctrine may seem strange and startling; like Gallio it cares for none of these things, or it trembles at the thought of them like Felix. In treating of Hell Father Sasia shirks no difficulty; in fact our one complaint would be that the book is rather overloaded and that with a view of exhausting his subject, the author has included illustrations and testimonies which do not add to the weight of his argument. The careful synopsis and Index with which it is provided make it handy as a book of reference.

DEVOTIONAL.

A certain freshness marks Sister M. Philip's *Our Lady's Month* (Sands: 3s. 6d. net), a mine often worked over but never exhausted as human experience grows. The book is composed of short readings for each day of May, on certain of the innumerable aspects of our Lady's holiness. They have been elaborated, as the Bishop of Northampton tells us in a stimulating preface, from practical lesson-notes, and should be useful to other teachers engaged in the instruction of children in their filial duty to God's Mother and theirs.

A new abridged edition of a work long out of print, *Méditations sur les Vertus religieuses*, by "Franc" (Maison de la Bonne Presse, 4.00 fr.) offers to the devout religious a course of excellent spiritual reading or prayer arranged for the whole year, a separate month being devoted to each great religious virtue.

APOLOGETIC.

The venerable Bishop of Versailles, whose pen is so unwearied in the task of presenting Christianity to his generation, has projected a new

trinity of volumes in view of the needs of a war-weary world,—*Religion, Famille, Patrie*. Of these the first, **Religion** (Téqui: 3.50 fr.) has now been published. It is a clear and simple exposition of the nature and need of religion, of its foundations in faith, of its expression in religious practices, of its fruits in good works—an admirably logical division, equally well elaborated and set forth.

The little book of essays by Father Slater, S.J., **Religion and Human Interests** (Washbourne: 1s. net) deals with the same theme in less exhaustive fashion. After describing what Religion is, he shows how it stands in regard to the individual, the family, the secularist ideal, conscience, business, liberty and the rule of force. An explanation of the New Code of Canon Law and especially of its bearing upon the subject of education closes a very thought-compelling and opportune volume.

No more useful course of reading for the young man or woman just entering the world of adult life could be suggested than the series of volumes dealing with the relations of the Church with human learning that have come or are coming from the busy and cultured pen of Dr. J. J. Walsh of New York. Our readers have already been introduced to most of them: the latest to hand is a third volume of **Catholic Churchmen in Science** (The Dolphin Press: \$1.00, postage extra), which following on the lines of previous volumes, gives interesting sketches of the careers and scientific exploits of distinguished ecclesiastics at different times. The present book includes an estimate of the astronomical work done under Papal patronage at or near the Vatican, of the contributions to science of Roger Bacon, of the many-sided Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, of the Abbé Spallazani, "a clerical precursor of Pasteur," and of the investigations concerning pre-historic man, accomplished in the caves of Southern France and Northern Spain by the Abbé Breuil and Pastor H. Obermaier. It is a stimulating record and should fill the Catholic with legitimate pride concerning the all-important accessions to human knowledge which under the inspiration of the Church her priests have brought about.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

We are glad to see that M. d'Herbigny's account of the life and writings of Soloviev, which we welcomed in November, 1911, has been translated, and very well translated, by Miss A. M. Buchanan under the title **Vladimir Soloviev: a Russian Newman** (Washbourne: 5s. net). Like the great man with whom his name is linked Soloviev's career was almost wholly intellectual. He lived in the world of thought and speculation, not idly but in the search which occupies all earnest minds, the search for truth. For truth means unity, and all around him he saw chaos and disorder. He wrote incessantly as his search proceeded, always hampered by the censorship of the Tsardom, until he discovered the principle of Unity in the See of Peter, the Head and Mother of all Churches. The book in which he embodied his discovery had to be written in French, and his own reception into the Church which occurred in 1896, some four years before his death, was kept at first a secret. M. d'Herbigny discusses this pilgrim's progress with great insight and appreciation, and his volume throws much light upon the religious and intellectual state of that geographical expression we used to call Russia.

A work of popular hagiography, **Sur les pas de nos Saints** (Maison de la Bonne Presse: 2.00 fr.) by Canon J. Verdunoy takes us through many

regions of *la belle France* and shows us many charming views of her historic churches and other features of interest. There are seven saints dealt with in this series, Saints Hilary, Martin, Radegonde, Bernard, Louis IX., Colette and Blessed Joan of Arc.

FICTION.

John Ayscough's latest novel—it is not easy to keep pace with them—*Jacqueline* (Chatto, Windus: 6s. net) will not enhance nor in any way mar his high reputation. It is an elaborate study in character, showing the disastrous effects of self-will unbalanced by prudence and experience. Jacqueline's self-will makes her enter a convent uncalled, and leave it equally impulsively, and makes her, furthermore, marry without reflection or knowledge, only to find that her husband, besides being a brute, is a German spy, of whom "Dora" obligingly releases her. Taught wisdom by these experiences, she devotes herself to the care of an imbecile mother and finds salvation in the steadfast and heroic performance of duty. Our impression of the story is that many of the accessory characters are more consistently and convincingly drawn than the heroine, especially the half-witted mother, who on several occasions shows that she is mad only north-west. The dialogue has all Ayscough's brilliance and humour, and the whole tale moves briskly.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A jubilee record of ecclesiastical educational work in a New York parish, that in which the Jesuit "Loyola" School is established, has been published with the title *Fifty Years in Yorkville 1866—1916* (Parish House: New York) by Father P. J. Dooley, S.J. The author manages to combine a good deal of information about the growth of America's capital with matter more connected with his theme, and the whole gives a pleasing and edifying picture of the good accomplished both for God and country by a vigorous ecclesiastical establishment with sound traditions and well-trying methods.

The second (1918) issue of *Orbis Catholicus* (Universe Office; 7s. net), edited by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Canon Glancey of Birmingham, follows the same general lines as the 1916 edition, but the editor has availed himself of various criticisms and suggestions to make the work correspond more exactly to its sub-title—*A Year-Book of the Catholic World*. A preliminary chapter gives clear information regarding various ecclesiastical persons and functions. Perhaps the most valuable addition is a chapter briefly stating the position of the Church in regard to numbers and freedom in the various countries of the world. The explanation of the relations between Church and State in Italy, in Germany, and in various other anti-Catholic or non-Catholic countries is admirably done. No Catholic writer or publicist can afford to be without this book, and truth, honesty and accuracy would gain if it were within easy reach of every able editor and journalist in the Commonwealth.

Father Arthur Barry, C.S.G., the author of several brightly written volumes on matters of clerical interest, gives us in *Clerical Safeguards*. (University Press, Indiana: \$1.25) yet another of the same stamp, characterized by the same soundness and moderation of view, the same wide reading and observation, and the same unforced humour. No priest can read this volume without profit, even if it merely consist in finding on his

head a somewhat unbecoming cap. The essays and dialogues, fourteen in number, have the American clergy mainly in view, but are sufficiently general to affect the whole genus.

The prospect of after-war reconstruction naturally suggests the production of sketches of ideal Utopias, much as the pre-war industrial despotism and chaos prompted the dreams of Bellamy and Morris. **The Tower** (Headley Bros. : 2s. net) by "Watchman," is a book of that sort, painting a new Earth and to some extent a new Heaven, for, in this re-fashioning of Society, all present religions, including the true one, are set aside to make room for a vague and comprehensive creed of benevolence and altruism, a religion without dogma and without sanction. It is all very beautiful and all very unreal—this dream of a religion which shall succeed where Christianity has *ex hypothesi* failed and will do more for the world than God Incarnate was able to do. But apart from the means, the end proposed is one for which all Christians should strive, for it is not Christianity to acquiesce in conditions of life wherein vast multitudes have, in order to live at all, to sacrifice their human dignity and their divine rights.

The Malthusians are continuing their pernicious advocacy of artificial birth-control and supporting their immoral suggestions by arguments, some wholly unsound, some arising out of unjust industrial conditions. We wish these misguided persons could be induced to read **Le Problème de la Natalité et la Morale Chrétienne** (Beauchesne : 95 c.), by the Abbé J. Verdier. For they would find therein clearly stated the fundamental vice which the Christian finds in their propaganda—the endeavour to separate pleasure from duty, to turn a means into an end, to misuse a natural function. And they would also find a thorough recognition of the evils against which their campaign is ostensibly directed, and a variety of plans for removing them. The first portion of the book is devoted to a statement of the facts in France, where the problem is most acute, and of the Catholic attitude in regard to them : the second contains a series of startling statistics which illustrate, by comparison with other lands, the rapid and progressive suicide of the French people. These figures and the deductions therefrom give the Catholic apologist valuable material for refuting the Malthusians on the lines of reason and experience. For they show that the root-cause of birth-restriction is not social or financial or physical, but moral : the deliberate choice of perverted human wills.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

One is sometimes dismayed when walking about a great city like London to note the impotence or the indifference of public authorities which results in the erection of architectural or artistic eye-sores, the constant triumph of utilitarianism over beauty. Mr. W. Randolph having made a brief survey of England from this point of view, has lately recorded his impressions in a brochure which he aptly styles **The Vandalisms of Peace** (Routledge : 1s. net). His proposition is "that the civilized world whether at home or abroad, is even under normal conditions becoming steadily and even rapidly impoverished in its inherited beauty and interest, while at the same time it is gathering to itself a vast incubus of new-made vulgarity and unsightliness." And of this mournful fact he gives, moving here and there over the country, many painful instances which may, we hope, awaken local or general remorse and stay the hand of the barbarian.

Catholics will find much that is interesting in the report on **The Evangelistic Work of the Church** (S.P.C.K.) issued by the third of the five

Committees of Inquiry which were one practical outcome of the "National Mission" two years ago. For it shows that Anglicans are keenly alive to the necessity of winning back to a knowledge of the Gospel the vast multitudes in this land who are out of touch with church and chapel, and combined with a clear grasp of the ideal, it indicates many suggestive ways of reaching it.

Amongst the many vindications of the Papal policy which ignorant and malicious attacks have called forth, that by the Archbishop of Toronto, **The Pope and the War** (Blake: 2½d.) holds an important place. His Grace, in addition to collecting from various sources unimpeachable testimonies to the Holy Father's prudence and beneficence, raises the question of the motives of those who invoke the spirit of religious bigotry in the midst of a campaign such as this.

The Zionist organization have issued a pamphlet—**Great Britain, Palestine and the Jews** (price, 1d.)—which contains a large collection of opinions expressed by various public and prominent men in Church and State, and various influential newspapers, all at least nominally Christian, in favour of the restoration of the Jews to Palestine as their natural home. The only opposition to this ideal appears to spring from a section of the Jews themselves.

A useful lesson is taught in a very artless way by a short drama called **The Philosophy of Patience** (Universal Publishing Co.: 9d. net) by W. H. Greenwood.

The artistic equipment of Mr. Leonard Burdett, who has written **Reward and other Poems of War** (Universal Publishing Co.: 8d.) is not on a level with his poetic feeling and the genuine piety which is expressed in his verses.

Mr. Francis Albino employs no publisher but sells his own beautifully printed book of poems, **The Cup of Bliss** (2s. net, postage 1d.) at 22, Ainger Road, London. Those who purchase it will find sound religious and philosophic reflections couched in melodious language, which though generally poetic has at times a curious pedestrian strain in it.

In **The Feast of the Crucifix** (Blackwell: 1s. 6d. net) Miss Gertrude Robinson has translated into appropriate English a beautiful little monastic legend from a fourteenth-century MS. and the publisher has provided a setting worthy of such a gem.

The Catholic body has only itself to blame that in these times of crisis the productions of the C.T.S. have sunk to a low ebb and that many of their most useful pamphlets, having gone out of print, cannot yet be reprinted. We welcome all the more heartily for their fewness the three pamphlets to hand, which are emphatically "tracts for the times,"—Bishop Keating's lucid treatment of **Divorce**; Mr. Belloc's trenchant analysis of the due relations between Church and State, called **Religion and Civil Liberty**; and **A Word about Nonconformists** by a convert from Methodism, who knowing the question from the inside is able to diagnose that strange disease which we may call "the Fear of Rome," and which so dominates the Free Churches.

The Westminster Catholic Federation, also in view of current needs, has published **Why Catholics oppose Divorce**, a plain statement of the grounds, social and mundane as well as religious, which move the Catholic mind to a deep abhorrence of this main solvent of family life. It may be ordered from the Catholic Social Guild (1, Victoria Street, S.W. 1: 1d.).

The four latest issues of *The Catholic Mind* (America Press: 5 c. each), those for February and March, contain some very valuable apologetic matter, for example, *The Psychology of Medieval Persecution*, by E. R. Hull, S.J., a careful study of a perplexing subject, *Faith and Facts*, by Professor Rahilly, an indictment of Rationalism which we have already noticed as a C.T.S. pamphlet, and the Archbishop of Toronto's exhaustive exposition, *The Pope and the War*, noticed above.

From the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland we have received ten penny pamphlets, six of them containing a number of bright short stories, whilst the others are *St. Joseph*, translated from the Italian; a vindication of *Mary Queen of Scots*, in two parts, by J. P. O'Kane; and *Pater Noster*, a devotional commentary from the Italian.

The Australian Catholic Truth Society publish a clear and forcible exposition of the doctrine of *Infallibility* (1d.) by Father Stanislaus M. Hogan, O.P.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice).

- THE AMERICA PRESS, New York.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XVI. Nos. 4-6.
- FROM THE AUTHOR.
The Cup of Bliss and other Poems.
 By F. Albino. Pp. 37. Price, 2s. net.
- BENZIGER BROTHERS, New York.
The Future Life. By J. C. Sasia, S.J. Pp. 362. Price, \$2.50.
- BLAKE & SON, Toronto.
The Pope and the War. By the Archbishop of Toronto. Pp. 24. Price, 2½d.
- BLACKWELL, Oxford.
The Feast of the Crucifix. Translated by Gertrude Robinson. Pp. 15. Price, 1s. 6d. net.
- CATHOLIC INSTRUCTION LEAGUE, Chicago.
Catechism for First Communion. By Rev. Francis Cassilly, S.J. Pp. 46. Price, 5 cents. And other Pamphlets.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.
 Several Penny Pamphlets.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND, Dublin.
 Several Penny Pamphlets.
- GILL & SON, Dublin.
The Last Independent Parliament of Ireland. Pp. xxv. 207. Price, 5s. net.
- MAISON DE LA BONNE PRESSE, Paris.
Méditations sur les Vertus religieuses. By Franc. Pp. 659. Price, 4.00 fr.
Sur les Pas de nos Saints. By Canon J. Verdunoy, Illustrated. Pp. 110. Price, 2 francs. Several pamphlets.
- PARISH HOUSE (53 East 83rd Street), New York.
Fifty Years in Yorkville. By P. J. Dooley, S.J. Pp. x. 353.
- ROUTLEDGE & SONS, London.
The Vandalisms of Peace. By W. Randolph. Pp. 48. Price, 1s. n.
- SANDS & CO., London.
Our Lady's Month. By Sister M. Philip. Pp. 157. Price, 3s. 6d. net.
- S.P.C.K., London.
The Apocalypse of Abraham and The Ascension of Isaiah. Edited by R. H. Charles, D.D. and G. H. Box, M.A. Pp. 161. Price, 4s. 6d. net. *The Challenge of the Universe*. By Rev. C. J. Shebbeare. Pp. xxiv. 245. Price, 7s. 6d. net. *The Evangelistic Work of the Church*. Pp. viii. 72. Price, 1s. net.
- STANLEY GIBBONS, London.
The Soldier and his Stamps. Price, 6d.
- TÉQUI, Paris.
Religion. By Mgr. Gibier. Pp. viii. 384. Price, 3.50 fr.
- UNIVERSAL PUBLISHING COMPANY, Chorley.
Reward and other Poems. By Leonard Burdett. Pp. 27. Price, 8d.
- ZIONIST ORGANIZATION, London.
Great Britain, Palestine and the Jews. Pp. 66. Price, 1d.

